
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

GoogleTM books

<https://books.google.com>



This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

GoogleTM books

<https://books.google.com>





Class 405

Book M689

v. 21-22

Acc. 292435

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA



3 1858 028 231 938

Volume XXII

January, 1927

Number 1

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

*A QUARTERLY JOURNAL EDITED FOR THE
MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION*

BY

J. G. ROBERTSON

G. C. MOORE SMITH

AND

EDMUND G. GARDNER



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: FETTER LANE, E.C. 4

CHICAGO: THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
(AGENT FOR THE UNITED STATES)

BOMBAY, CALCUTTA AND MADRAS: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.
TOKYO: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

Price Seven Shillings net

*Annual Subscription, 25s net post free; in United States
\$6.00 (single copies \$1.75 each)*

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Three Anglo-Saxon Charms from the 'Lacnunga.' By J. H. G. GRATTAN | 1 |
| John Marston, Dramatist. Some New Facts about his Life. By R. E. BRETTE | 7 |
| Bunyan's Mr Ignorance. By JOHN W. DRAPER | 15 |
| The Text of Cowper's 'Letters.' By K. POVEY | 22 |
| Rare or Unexplained Words in the Anglo-Norman 'Voyage of St Brendan.' A Contribution to French Lexicography (cont.). By E. G. R. WATERS | 28 |
| Additional Notes on Luis de León's Lyrics. I, II. By W. J. ENTWISTLE | 44 |
| Herder's Influence on the Metrical Version of Hölderlin's 'Hyperion.' By MARSHALL MONTGOMERY | 61 |

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

| | |
|---|----|
| Further Notes on 'Beowulf.' By P. G. THOMAS.—Two Newly Found Middle English Texts. By CYRIL BRETT.—Italian Sources of Lyrics of Thomas Lodge. By ALICE WALKER.—Vaughan and Cowper. By L. C. MARTIN.—Swinburne and Walt Whitman. By GEORGES LA-FOURCADE.—Some New Arthurian Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library. By E. S. MURRELL.—Notes on the Gothic Calendar (Cod. Ambros. A). By GEORGE FRIEDRICHSEN | 70 |
|---|----|

REVIEWS

| | |
|--|----|
| A. S. Cook, <i>Cynewulf's Part in our Beowulf</i> (S. J. CRAWFORD).— <i>Mittelenglische Originalurkunden</i> , herausg. von H. M. Flasdieck (CYRIL BRETT).—E. Vinaver, <i>Le Roman de Tristan et Iseut dans l'Œuvre de Malory</i> (SIR E. K. CHAMBERS).— <i>A Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions</i> (1578), ed. by H. E. Rollins (F. SIDGWICK).—A. Gray, <i>A Chapter in the Early Life of Shakespeare: Polesworth in Arden</i> (SIR E. K. CHAMBERS).—A. H. Tolman, <i>Falstaff and other Shakespearean Topics</i> (R. H. CASE).— <i>The Plague Pamphlets of Thomas Dekker</i> , ed. by F. P. Wilson (G. C. MOORE SMITH).—P. Dottin, <i>Daniel Defoe et ses Romans</i> (H. V. ROUTH).—V. Klemperer, <i>Geschichte der französischen Literatur</i> , v, 1 (D. G. LARG).—D. G. Larg, <i>Madame de Staël (1766–1800)</i> (DORIS GUNNELL).—R. Murriss, <i>La Hollande et les Hollandais au XVII^e et au XVIII^e Siècles</i> ; J. Franssen, <i>Les Comédiens français en Hollande</i> (B. W. DOWNS).—H. Brinkmann, <i>Geschichte der lateinischen Liebesdichtung im Mittelalter</i> ; H. Brinkmann, <i>Entstehungsgeschichte des Minnesangs</i> (M. F. RICHEY).—F. Ranke, <i>Tristan und Isolde</i> (R. PRIEBSCHE).—J. Sampson, <i>The Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales</i> (W. E. COLLINSON) | 94 |
|--|----|

SHORT NOTICES

| | |
|---|-----|
| D. D. Griffith, <i>Bibliography of Chaucer, 1908–24</i> .—E. Seaton, <i>Queen Elizabeth and a Swedish Princess</i> .—G. F. Bradby, <i>About Shakespeare and his Plays</i> .— <i>The Poems of John Milton</i> , II, ed. by H. J. C. Grierson.— <i>Satirical Poems by William Mason with Notes by Horace Walpole</i> , ed. by P. Toynbee.— <i>The Shelley Correspondence in the Bodleian Library</i> , ed. by R. H. Hill.—J. Postma, <i>Tennyson as seen by his Parodists</i> .— <i>Das altfranzösische Rolandlied</i> , herausg. von A. Hilka.— <i>Adam, a Religious Play of the Twelfth Century</i> , transl. by E. N. Stone.—M. L. Barker, <i>A Handbook of German Intonation</i> .—K. P. Moritz, <i>Anton Reiser</i> , transl. by P. E. Matheson.—H. M. Buckhurst, <i>Elementary Grammar of Old Icelandic</i> | 116 |
| NEW PUBLICATIONS (September–November, 1926) | 121 |

**THE
MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW
VOLUME XXII**

1927

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON: FETTER LANE, E.C. 4

CHICAGO: THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

(AGENT FOR THE UNITED STATES)

BOMBAY, CALCUTTA AND MADRAS: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD

TOKYO: MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

*A QUARTERLY JOURNAL EDITED FOR THE
MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION*

BY

J. G. ROBERTSON

G. C. MOORE SMITH

AND

EDMUND G. GARDNER

VOLUME XXII



CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1927

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

| ARTICLES. | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| BOSTOCK, J. KNIGHT, The Maid of Orleans in German Literature | 298 |
| BRETT, CYRIL, Notes on Old and Middle English | 257 |
| BRETTE, R. E., John Marston, Dramatist. Some New Facts about his Life | 7 |
| BUDD, F. E., A Minor Italian Critic of the Sixteenth Century: Jason Denores | 421 |
| DRAPER, JOHN W., Bunyan's Mr Ignorance | 15 |
| ENTWISTLE, WILLIAM J., Additional Notes on Luis de León's Lyrics | 44, 173 |
| GRATTAN, J. H. G., Three Anglo-Saxon Charms from the 'Lacnunga' | 1 |
| GRAY, H. D., 'A Cure for a Cuckold' by Heywood, Rowley and Webster | 389 |
| JESPERSEN, OTTO, The Ending '-ster' | 129 |
| LEGROS, RENÉ P., L' 'Orlando Furioso' et la 'Princesse de Babylone' de Voltaire | 155 |
| MONTGOMERY, MARSHALL, Herder's Influence on the Metrical Version of Hölderlin's 'Hyperion' | 61 |
| ORB, JOHN, Problems of French Word-Formation | 276, 398 |
| PATCH, H. R., Chaucer and Lady Fortune | 377 |
| POVEY, K., The Text of Cowper's 'Letters' | 22 |
| TILLEY, A., The Fifth Book of Rabelais | 409 |
| TOYNBEE, PAGET, Some Notes on the Text of Dante's 'De Vulgari Eloquentia' | 162 |
| WATERS, E. G. R., Rare or Unexplained Words in the Anglo-Norman 'Voyage of St Brendan.' A Contribution to French Lexicography (<i>cont.</i>) | 28 |
| WRIGHT, HERBERT G., Henry Crabb Robinson's 'Essay on Blake' | 137 |
| WRIGHT, LOUIS B., Stage Duelling in the Elizabethan Theatre | 265 |
| YATES, FRANCES A., Some New Light on 'L'Écossaise' of Antoine de Montchrétien | 285 |

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

| | |
|---|-----|
| ALLEN, BEATRICE, 'The Debate of the Soul and the Body' in MS. Digby 86 | 189 |
| ASHDOWN, MARGARET, 'The Wanderer,' ll. 41-43 | 313 |
| BRADNER, LEICESTER, The Play of 'Marcus Geminus' and its Source | 314 |
| BRETT, CYRIL, Two Newly Found Middle English Texts | 73 |
| BRETTE, R. E., Marston born in Oxfordshire | 317 |
| DODDS, MADELEINE HOPE, A Second Visit to Gondaliand | 197 |
| DUSTOOR, P. E., Notes on 'The Knightes Tale' | 438 |
| FRIEDRICHSEN, GEORGE, Notes on the Gothic Calendar (Cod. Ambros. A) | 90 |
| GREG, W. W., 'A Hundreth Sundrie Flowers' | 441 |
| JOHNSON, F. C., Grenoble MS. 866 | 322 |
| JONES, KATHERINE, The Source of Achim von Arnim's 'Owen Tudor' | 447 |
| LAFOURCADE, GEORGES, Swinburne and Walt Whitman | 84 |
| LINTHICUM, M. CHANNING, Benedick's Love Symptoms: Cosmetics and Costume | 442 |
| MARTIN, L. C., Vaughan and Cowper | 79 |
| MOORE, SAMUEL, The New Chaucer Items | 435 |
| MURRELL, E. S., Some New Arthurian Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library | 87 |
| ORB, JOHN, and E. G. R. WATERS, Old French 'En Aines' | 199 |
| SANDISON, HELEN E., Lincoln v. Dymock and a Scurrilous Play, 1610 | 444 |
| SCOTT, JANET G., The Influence of Ronsard | 446 |
| SCOTT, JANET G., The Sources of Spenser's 'Amoretti' | 189 |
| STARNES, D. T., Elyot's 'Governour' and Peacham's 'Compleat Gentleman' | 319 |
| THOMAS, P. G., Further Notes on 'Beowulf' | 70 |
| TOMPKINS, J. M. S., Jane Eyre's 'Iron Stroud' | 195 |

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES *cont.*

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| WALKER, ALICE, Italian Sources of Lyrics of Thomas Lodge | 75 |
| WATERS, E. G. R., and JOHN ORR, Old French 'En Aines' | 199 |
| WILLIAMS, R. A., 'Beowulf,' ll. 1086-88 | 310 |

REVIEWS.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Baesecke, G., Lichtdrucke nach althochdeutschen Handschriften (ROBERT PRIEBSCHE) | 480 |
| Balderstone, K. C., The History and Sources of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith (H. V. D. DYSON) | 465 |
| Baudiš, J., Grammar of Early Welsh (J. GLYN DAVIES) | 356 |
| Baudri de Bourgueil, Oeuvres poétiques, éd. par P. Abrahams (LOUIS BRANDIN) | 471 |
| Beowulf, transl. by D. H. Crawford (S. J. CRAWFORD) | 325 |
| Beowulf, transl. by A. Strong (S. J. CRAWFORD) | 325 |
| Blanchard, F. T., Fielding the Novelist (OLIVER ELTON) | 225 |
| Brauer, H., Die Bücherei von St Gallen und das althochdeutsche Schrifttum (A. C. DUNSTAN) | 353 |
| Brinkmann, H., Entstehungsgeschichte des Minnesangs (M. F. RICHEY) | 110 |
| Brinkmann, H., Geschichte der lateinischen Lieberdichtung (M. F. RICHEY). | 110 |
| Brown, B. D., A Study of the Middle English Southern Passion (CYRIL BRETT) | 449 |
| Brusendorff, A., The Chaucer Tradition (MARIO PRAZ) | 202 |
| Castro, A., El Pensamiento de Cervantes (W. J. ENTWISTLE) | 236 |
| Chaucer, G., The Nun's Priest's Tale, ed. by K. Sisam (G. H. COWLING) | 448 |
| Citoleux, M., Alfred de Vigny (D. G. LARG) | 232 |
| Conley, C. H., The First English Translations of the Classics (G. D. WILLCOCK) | 460 |
| Cook, A. S., Cynewulf's Part in our Beowulf (S. J. CRAWFORD) | 94 |
| Dante, The Minor Poems of, transl. by L. de' Lucchi (EDMUND G. GARDNER) | 344 |
| Dekker, T., The Plague Pamphlets of, ed. by F. P. Wilson (G. C. MOORE SMITH) | 102 |
| Dottin, P., Daniel Defoe et ses romans (H. V. ROUTH) | 104 |
| Drinkwater, J., A Book for Bookmen (ALLARDYCE NICOLL) | 338 |
| Eppelsheimer, H. W., Petrarca (T. OKEY) | 350 |
| Fehr, B., Die englische Literatur des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts (C. H. HERFORD) | 228 |
| Festa, N., Saggio sull' Africa del Petrarca (CESARE FOLIGNO) | 346 |
| Fitzmaurice-Kelly, J., A New History of Spanish Literature (W. J. ENTWISTLE) | 478 |
| Flasdieck, H. M., Mittelenglische Originalurkunden, 1405-30 (CYRIL BRETT) | 96 |
| Fletcher, Phineas, Venus and Anchises and other Poems, ed. by E. Seaton (W. L. RENWICK) | 462 |
| Fransen, J., Les Comédiens français en Hollande au 17me et au 18me siècles (B. W. DOWNS) | 224 |
| Frere, J. H., The Monks and the Giants, ed. by R. D. Waller (G. C. MOORE SMITH) | 109 |
| Friedrichsen, G. W. S., The Gothic Version of the Gospels (A. C. DUNSTAN) | 336 |
| Gelzer, H., Guy de Maupassant (D. G. LARG) | 238 |
| Gollanz, Sir I., The Sources of Hamlet (F. S. BOAS) | 343 |
| Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions, A (1578), ed. by H. E. Rollins (F. SIDGWICK) | 462 |
| Gray, A., Polesworth in Arden (Sir E. K. CHAMBERS) | 98 |
| Guha, P. K., On Two Problems in Shakespeare (R. H. CASE) | 99 |
| Harington, Sir John, Epigrams, ed. by N. E. McClure (G. C. MOORE SMITH) | 463 |
| Harrower, R. B., A New Theory of Dante's Matelda (EDMUND G. GARDNER) | 333 |
| Hundreth Sundrie Flowers, A (GENEVIEVE AMBROSE) | 344 |
| | 214 |

REVIEWS *cont.*

PAGE

| | |
|--|-----|
| Jespersen, O., Mankind, Nation and Individual from a Linguistic Point of View (W. E. COLLINSON) | 357 |
| Johannes de Irlandia, The Meroure of Wyssdome, ed. by C. Macpherson (G. R. OWST) | 459 |
| Kennedy, A. G., A Bibliography of Writings on the English Language (A. MAWER) | 466 |
| Klemperer, V., Geschichte der französischen Literatur, V (D. G. LARG) | 105 |
| Krapp, G. P., The English Language in America (W. E. COLLINSON) | 468 |
| Kuhl, E. P., The Authorship of 'The Taming of the Shrew' (H. DUGDALE SYKES) | 328 |
| Lai d'Haveloc, Le, and Gaimar's Haveloc Episode, ed. by A. Bell (M. K. POPE) | 476 |
| Lamm, M., Strindbergs dramer (J. G. ROBERTSON) | 354 |
| Larg, D. G., Madame de Staël, 1766-1800 (DORIS GUNNELL) | 107 |
| Lerch, E., Historische französische Syntax, I (F. S. SHEARS) | 474 |
| Libelle of Englyshe Polycye, The, ed. by Sir G. Warner (E. CURTIS) | 458 |
| Lucas, F. L., Authors Dead and Living (H. V. ROUTH) | 338 |
| Manly, J. M., Chaucer and the Rhetoricians (G. H. COWLING) | 448 |
| Manly, J. M., English Prose and Poetry, selected and annotated by (G. C. MOORE SMITH) | 336 |
| Medwall, H., Fulgens and Lucrez, ed. by F. S. Boas and A. W. Reed (WALTER WORRELL) | 210 |
| Meillet, A., La Méthode comparative en linguistique historique (W. E. COLLINSON) | 357 |
| Morris, R., La Hollande et les Hollandais vus par les Français (B. W. DOWNS) | 109 |
| Nagl, J. W., und J. Zeidler, Deutsch-Österreichische Literaturgeschichte, III, i (G. WATERHOUSE) | 481 |
| Peers, E. Allison, Studies of the Spanish Mystics, I (A. F. G. BELL) | 351 |
| Petersen, J., Die Wesensbestimmung der deutschen Romantik (J. G. ROBERTSON) | 240 |
| Petrarca, F., Africa, ed. per cura di N. Festa (CESARE FOLIGNO) | 346 |
| Ranke, F., Tristan und Isold (ROBERT PRIEBSON) | 112 |
| Reed, A. W., Early Tudor Drama (Sir E. K. CHAMBERS) | 208 |
| Robertson, J. M., The Problems of the Shakespeare Sonnets (ALLARDYCE NICOLL) | 330 |
| Sainéan, L., Sources indigènes de l'étymologie française (F. S. SHEARS) | 472 |
| Saint Joan of Orleans, transl. by J. Evans, ed. by P. Studer (M. K. POPE) | 341 |
| Sampson, J., The Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales (W. E. COLLINSON) | 114 |
| Schröter, E., Walahfrids deutsche Glossierung und der althochdeutsche Tatian (A. C. DUNSTAN) | 353 |
| Seylaz, L., E. Poe et les premiers symbolistes français (FREDERICK C. ROE) | 234 |
| Shakespeare, W., The Merchant of Venice, ed. by Sir A. Quiller-Couch and J. D. Wilson (Sir E. K. CHAMBERS) | 220 |
| Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, ed. by J. R. R. Tolkien and E. V. Gordon (CYRIL BRETT) | 451 |
| Sisson, C. J., Shakespeare in India (R. H. CASE) | 463 |
| Smith, H. J., Goldsmith's The Citizen of the World (H. V. D. DYSON) | 465 |
| Strong, A. T., and R. S. Wallace, English Verse and Prose: a New Anthology (G. C. MOORE SMITH) | 337 |
| Tolman, A. H., Falstaff and other Shakespearean Topics (R. H. CASE) | 101 |
| Vinaver, E., Études sur le Tristan en Prose (F. C. JOHNSON) | 230 |

REVIEWS *cont.*

| | PAGE |
|--|--------------------|
| Vinaver, E., <i>Le Roman de Tristan et Iseut dans l'œuvre de Malory</i> (Sir E. K. CHAMBERS) | 97 |
| Wyatt, A. J., <i>The Threshold of Anglo-Saxon</i> (S. J. CRAWFORD) | 328 |
| SHORT NOTICES. | |
| Barker, M. L., <i>A Handbook of German Intonation</i> | 119 |
| Bonet, Honoré, <i>Apparicion Maistre Jehan de Meun</i> , ed. by I. Arnold | 246 |
| Bradby, G. F., <i>About Shakespeare and his Plays</i> | 116 |
| Brie, F., <i>Englische Rokoko-Epik</i> | 361 |
| Buckhurst, H. M., <i>Elementary Grammar of Old Icelandic</i> | 120 |
| Christ and Satan, ed. by Merrell Dare Clubb | 486 |
| Cook, A. S., and C. B. Tinker, <i>Select Translations from O.E. Poetry</i> | 485 |
| Davis, R. M., <i>Stephen Duck, the Thresher-Poet</i> | 488 |
| Dickman, A. J., <i>Le Rôle du surnaturel dans les Chansons de Geste</i> | 362 |
| Dunn, E. C., <i>Ben Jonson's Art</i> | 244 |
| Fischer, W., <i>Amerikanische Prosa, 1863-1922</i> | 362 |
| Garrod, H. W., <i>Wordsworth</i> | 489 |
| Graham, W., <i>The Beginnings of English Literary Periodicals</i> | 361 |
| Griffith, D. D., <i>A Bibliography of Chaucer, 1908-24</i> | 116 |
| Herder, J. G., <i>Briefwechsel mit Caroline Flachsland</i> | 364 |
| Klenze, C. von, <i>From Goethe to Hauptmann</i> | 365 |
| Konrad von Würzburg, <i>Legenden, i, ii</i> | 363 |
| Kraus, C. von, <i>Mittelhochdeutsches Übungsbuch</i> | 246 |
| Lynch, K. M., <i>The Social Mode of Restoration Comedy</i> | 488 |
| Mabinogi, <i>Die vier Zweige des, herausg. von L. Mühlhausen</i> | 489 |
| Marie de France, <i>Aus dem Esope der, herausg. von K. Warnke</i> | 246 |
| Mason, W., <i>Satirical Poems with Notes by Horace Walpole</i> , ed. by Paget Toynbee | 117 |
| Massinger, P., <i>A New Way to Pay Old Debts</i> , ed. by A. H. Cruickshank | 244 |
| Milton, J., <i>The Poems of</i> , ed. by H. J. C. Grierson, II | 116 |
| Moritz, K. P., <i>Anton Reiser</i> , transl. by P. E. Matheson | 120 |
| Mystère d'Adam, <i>Le</i> , transl. by E. N. Stone | 119 |
| Nebrija, <i>Gramática de la Lengua Castellana</i> , ed. G. Llubera | 363 |
| Østerberg, V., <i>Grevinden af Salisbury og Marina</i> | 243 |
| Pack of Autolycus, <i>The</i> , ed. by H. E. Rollins | 487 |
| Postma, J., <i>Tennyson as seen by his Parodists</i> | 118 |
| Raoul de Cambrai, transl. by Jessie Crosland | 245 |
| Ray, B. K., <i>The Character of Gawain</i> | 242 |
| Rolandslied, <i>Das altfranzösische</i> , herausg. von A. Hinka | 118 |
| St Erkenwald, <i>a Middle English Poem</i> , ed. by H. L. Savage | 487 |
| Seaton, E., <i>Queen Elizabeth and a Swedish Princess</i> | 116 |
| Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, herausg. von W. Keller, LXI | 360 |
| Shelley Correspondence in the Bodleian Library, <i>The</i> | 117 |
| Spenser, E., <i>Epithalamion</i> , ed. by C. Van Winkle | 243 |
| Spurgeon, C. F. E., <i>Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion</i> | 242 |
| Walpole, Horace, <i>Supplement to the Letters of</i> , III, ed. by Paget Toynbee | 245 |
| Weber, P. C., <i>America in Imaginative German Literature, 1800-50</i> | 247 |
| Wells, J. E., <i>Manual of the Writings in Middle English, Third Supplement</i> | 486 |
| Year's Work in English Studies, <i>The</i> , ed. by F. S. Boas and C. H. Herford | 360 |
| NEW PUBLICATIONS | 121, 248, 366, 490 |

THREE ANGLO-SAXON CHARMS FROM THE 'LACNUNGA'

IN the course of a careful study of the *Lacnunga*¹ during the last three years, the neglect which has befallen much of its contents, including verse of considerable importance in the history of English culture, has been continually forced upon one's notice.

I make no apology, therefore, for putting forward some emendations and interpretations to three of the most interesting of our Anglo-Saxon Charms. In the case of two of these, I hope that some of the following suggestions may be accepted by scholars: in the case of the third, I may claim to have offered a reasonable, though not necessarily complete interpretation for the first time.

I. THE CHARM FOR SUDDEN STITCH.

(Grein-Wülcker, I, pp. 317-19.)

The exact meaning of l. 3 (l. 5 in Gr.-W.) is still undetermined. The latest scholar to treat of this Charm² draws attention to Sweet's unnecessary insertion of *þæt* in the subordinate clause. Disregarding the possibility of a paratactic final clause, he will have it that the clause in question is conditional. It is difficult, however, to admit the likelihood of a protasis in this context. One may indeed make some kind of sense by passing lightly over the meaning and mood of *mote*, as Professor Horn has done in his translation 'wenn du dieser Feindschaft entgehen willst.' But if one adheres to the meaning of *þu mote*, viz. 'thou be permitted,' or 'it be granted thee,' it is realised at once that the addition of such a parenthetic conditional clause would have somewhat shaken the patient's faith in the practitioner.

Another, though a less weighty objection to assuming an *if*-clause, is that the twenty-five lines of this Charm actually contain not far short of a dozen hypotactic clauses introduced by *3if*. Perhaps a more likely meaning is something like this: 'If you do as I tell you, then you will recover.' And this interpretation does not appear to be grammatically

¹ A new edition of this text, with notes and translation, is being prepared by Dr Chas. Singer and myself, and is to appear shortly.

² W. Horn, *Der altenglische Zauberspruch gegen den Hexenschuss*, continued in the *Festschrift für Johannes Hoops* (Germ. Bibl. II, 20).

2 *Three Anglo-Saxon Charms from the 'Lacnunga'*

impossible, in spite of the rarity of the pres. subjunctive in such constructions (cf. Wülfing, *Syntax*, § 421). Here is implied condition; but in turning the parataxis into hypotaxis we have sought our protasis in the first half line. The translation will then be: 'Shield thou thee now; then mayest thou survive this onset.'

Of course there still remains the possibility that the line is corrupt and should be emended to *mote þu ðisne nið zenesan!* 'Mayest thou escape this onset!'

Two metrically incomplete lines in this Charm can be put right by means of simple and palaeographically reasonable insertions:

| | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| l. 15 (17 in Gr.-W.): | ut, [ut,] spere! | næs in spere! |
| l. 26 (28 in Gr.-W.): | hal westu [nu]! | helpe ðin drihten! |

There still remain three corrupt passages: ll. 11, 12 (Gr.-W., 13, 14), 19 (Gr.-W., 21), and 25 (Gr.-W., 27, 28).

Opinions will always differ as to how far it is justifiable to make conjectural emendations to a one-text MS. Yet one cannot but regard Grimm's conjectured second half of l. 19 as brilliant, and one must regret that he did not make an equally good guess in the case of ll. 11, 12, which have completely baffled his distant followers, great and small.

Less genius is required to make a plausible emendation to l. 25, since the situation suggests the clue. If we regard the actual prophylaxis as finishing with l. 24, we may imagine it followed by suggestion and encouragement, and in some such form perhaps as 'The thing which has been causing the trouble has now been completely dispersed.'

Now, one past tense is already given us, viz. *hæfde*, which only misplaced ingenuity can remove from its proper place at the end of l. 25. Hence we may assume that the first verb in the line (which in the MS. may be *fleo* or *fled*) is not to be emended to *fleoh* but to *fleah*.

My reading, then, of this line is:

fle[ah] þær on fyrȝen[holt]; [fyrst ne] hæfde,
'It hath fled there to the mountains; no respite hath it had.'

II. THE NINE HERBS CHARM. (Gr.-W. I, pp. 320-23.)

Apart from the obscure allusions in ll. 2 and 24, the first forty lines of this Charm present comparatively few difficulties.

In l. 6, *færð* must be emended, on metrical grounds, to *færeð*; cf. l. 20.

The MS. reading in l. 31, *toslat henan*, needs no alteration to *he nan*, but merely re-spacing to *he nan*, 'nought did he destroy.'

There seems no need to assume a lacuna after l. 34; for Wülcker overlooked the reference back to the adder: 'There did apple and venom bring it about that she never would turn into the house.'

The first bad corruption confronts us in l. 43 (Gr.-W., 44, 45). Here the MS. reading is *wið feondes hond & wið þæs hond wið frea bezde*.

Cockayne's note '*& wið þæs hond* should, it seems, be erased' indicates that he recognised a scribal attempt at editing. Rather reluctantly, it would seem, Wülcker rejects Cockayne's view, and makes two lines of the passage, or rather one complete and one fragmentary line. Neither editor, however, offers a satisfactory interpretation of the fragment *wið frea bezde*.

The restoration of one letter will give the original reading:

wið feondes hond, & wið frea-b[r]egde,

'against hand of fiend, and against mighty devices.' Admittedly, the compound *frea-brezd* is not elsewhere recorded; but cf. *nearu-brezd* (with closely similar meaning), and the numerous compounds of *frea*.

It is strange that no one has yet pointed out that the Charm does not end at l. 44 (Gr.-W., 46), but that the eleven lines of prose which there follow constitute, with but half-a-dozen emendations, nineteen lines of good alliterative verse¹.

Two of the necessary emendations were made by Cockayne. He restored *þys[te]lzeblæd* in l. 53 (Gr.-W., 52), as both sense and metre demand. And 'for the rhythm' he wished to omit *cume* from l. 55 (Gr.-W., 53): in the MS. it is inserted above the line, and is clearly scribes' editing.

The four others are as follows:

In l. 48 (Gr.-W., 49), for *wedenan* (which has obviously caught the scribe's eye from two lines below) read [*hæw*]enan, demanded by both sense and alliteration. Note that there still remain only nine poisons; for, since *runol* is the only one of the ten epithets of *attor* which does not denote a definite colour, the 'red poison' and the 'foul poison' may be assumed to be one and the same thing.

In l. 60 (Gr.-W., 56) insert [*nu*] before *behealdað*, for the sake of alliteration and metre.

On l. 56 (Gr.-W., 54) Cockayne remarks that 'the omission of the South is probably an error of the transcriber.' There are, however, two reasons why there can have been no mention of the South in the original

¹ Long after the text of the forthcoming edition of the *Lacnunga* was complete and ready for press, I learnt that this fact had not escaped the keen critical eye of Professor W. J. Sedgefield.

4 *Three Anglo-Saxon Charms from the 'Lacnunga'*

text. One is to be found in Grein-Wülcker; and the other is that an extra poison would have spoilt the scheme: six blisters plus three venoms give the correct number nine. That some omission has actually taken place in the line is shown by the metre; and, from the point of view of meaning and alliteration, the verb *zenæzan* will fill the gap well enough.

Of my fourth emendation I am less confident. Indeed, I put it forward only in the hope that someone else will throw light on the meaning and derivation of a puzzling word.

Two guesses at the word *ænzancundes* of the MS. are known to me: 'oppositively' (Cockayne), and 'in a way that is unique' (Toller). I would add another, emending to *ænzancunde* (adj., acc. pl.).

The preceding word in the MS. is *alde*. Cockayne, with his mind still on poisons and diseases, altered to *adle*, and his alteration has provoked no criticism. But the meaning attached to *Crist stod* requires that *ofer* should be followed by an accusative rather than a dative.

Provisionally, therefore, I read l. 55 (Gr.-W., 58) as:

Crist stod ofer alde, ænzancunde,

and translate: 'Christ stood above the ancient ones, the malignant ones,' who are, of course, the Powers of Evil.

III. THE NIGHTMARE CHARM.

(Gr.-W., I, p. 326.)

This Charm has suffered much at the hands of scribes and editors.

Owing to Cockayne having unfortunately miscopied *dweorh* ('dwarf') as *weorh* ('warty eruption,' 'Geschwulst') in the prose introduction, the Charm itself has hitherto remained unintelligible. (One may note here that Toller, in his *A.S. Dict. Supplement*, restored by conjecture the actual MS. reading.)

When one has once seen what the Charm is about, it is not difficult, by means of a few slight emendations and some re-divisions of the alliterative lines, to restore at any rate most of the original text.

The first half of this Charm is concerned with the disease that is to be treated. The 'dwarf,' or incubus, bridles and mounts his victim and drives him out over the sea. The restored text of this first half reads:

| | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| her com inzanzan | in[wr]i[ð]en wiht. | |
| hæfde him his haman on handa, | cwæð þæt þu his hæncæst wære. | |
| leȝ[d]e þe his teaze [o]n sweoran; | onzunnan him of þæm lande lipan. | |
| sona swa hy of þæm lande coman | þa onzunnan him þa [leomu] colian. | |
| 'Here came marching in a creature all swathed. | | |
| He had his bridle in his hand, said that thou wert his steed. | | |
| Laid his bonds on thy neck; they began to sail off the land. | | |
| As soon as they came off the land then began their limbs to cool.' | | |

The MS. reading of the first part of the second half of l. 1 is either *inspiden* or *inswiden*. That we have here neither the preposition *in* nor the article *an* is clear; for the metre demands a stressed syllable which will provide a vowel-alliteration to *in3anzan*. The prefix *on-* might conceivably satisfy this requirement, but it is more likely that the word corrupted was some compound with *in-*. Cf. *inbewindan*, *inbeureon*, *infrod*, *inhold*. My conjectural emendation is based on the assumption that the incubus took the form of a corpse swathed in its grave-clothes.

In l. 2 *haman* may, of course, mean 'covering'; but the context would seem to support the view that the word 'hame' is far older than has hitherto been realised. According to the *N.E.D.* its first appearance in English is in 1303; the special meaning of this word is, to the best of my knowledge, first on record in Middle Low German.

In l. 3 the two simple emendations need no explanation: MS. C. Gr.-W., *leze*, *teazean*.

In l. 4 the word supplied is required for sense and alliteration. The scribe himself noticed that there was a word short, and inserted *ðah* above the line between *him* and *þa*: his emendation is, of course, to be cancelled.

The second half of the Charm is concerned with the cure.

That the female divinity, who makes an end to the evil and promises future immunity through the use of the Charm, is not the sister of the incubus creature, is clear from the alliteration: *deores* is obviously corrupt.

There can be little doubt that the disperser of the terrors of the night is the dawn. The beneficent deity, then, is *Eastre*, the Goddess of the Dawn. (This fact, so obvious when once pointed out, had escaped my search until I asked the help of my friend and teacher Professor R. Priebisch. On seeing my interpretation of the rest of the Charm, he pounced on *Eastre* immediately.)

It remains however to find a god whose name will give the necessary vowel-alliteration and who may conceivably be brother to *Eastre*.

Obviously one is tempted to equate the name with the *Er* which has been preserved in the Bavarian *Ertag* (Tuesday), and to believe that, as Wolfgang Golther remarks (*Handbuch der germanischen Mythologie*, p. 210), '*Er ist Tiu unter anderem Namen.*' Our Charm will in this case have revealed an instance of the genitive form of which Jacob Grimm lamented he could not find a record.

There may yet be something in the old view that behind the confusion of runic names in Old English and Old High German the name of a god

6 *Three Anglo-Saxon Charms from the 'Lacnunga'*

lies hidden. If the names *ear* and *tir* in O.E. and *aer* and *ziu* in O.H.G. are applied to the same rune, then *ear* and *aer* may well both hide the name of a lost god. My reading of his name as *ear* is, of course, tentative.

As to the original form and meaning of this name. That in the O.E. *Runic Poem* the word *ear* means 'earth' (O.N. *aurr*) is not disputed; and it is obvious that this word can have no connexion with *er* and *aer*. But it is not in the least unlikely that we have a homonym here: cf. the rune *ōss*, in Icelandic 'god,' and in Norwegian 'river-mouth.'

I assume, then, that the original word was a masculine form of **ahuz*, **ahiz* (O.E. *ear*, O.H.G. *ehir*). This etymology has the advantage of connecting the word with the High German forms *aer* and *er*; for in the case of so rare a word the omission of an *h* in writing is surely not inexplicable. The primary meaning then of all these forms was 'sharp,' 'pointed'; and the assumption that one of them denoted an hypostasis of some phenomenon of the morning sky (cf. *ῥοδοδάκτυλος ἠώς*) does not seem unreasonable.

We have now only to emend, in l. 7, the non-alliterating *derian*, which is clearly a West Saxon substitution for *e3lian*.

The restored text of the second half of the Charm then reads:

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| <i>þa com in3an3an</i> | <i>[ea]res sweoster.</i> |
| <i>þa 3eændode heo</i> | <i>& a3as swor</i> |
| <i>ðæt næfre þis ðæm adle3an</i> | <i>[e3]lian ne moste,</i> |
| <i>ne þæm þe þis 3aldor</i> | <i>be3ytan mihte,</i> |
| <i>oððe þe þis 3aldor</i> | <i>on3alan cuþe.</i> |
| ‘Then came in the sister of Ear. | |
| She made then an end and oaths she swore | |
| That never this one the sick should harm, | |
| Nor him who might obtain this Charm, | |
| Or understand this Charm to sing.’ | |

J. H. G. GRATTAN.

LONDON.

JOHN MARSTON, DRAMATIST

SOME NEW FACTS ABOUT HIS LIFE

WITH the exception of a few minor details, all that is at present known of what may be called the extra-literary life of John Marston the dramatist rests on two fundamental assumptions: the first and more important, that the dramatist was the son of John Marston of Coventry, gentleman, sometime a Master of the Bench of the Middle Temple; the second and less important, that the John Marston of Warwickshire, a gentleman's son aged sixteen who was matriculated a member of the University of Oxford from Brasenose College on 4 February 1592¹ was the same as the son of the aforementioned John Marston of Coventry.

The slender evidence for these two very probable assumptions, which are generally more or less unconsciously made, cannot be discussed here. But those working on these assumptions and using information from heraldic collections, university registers, and ecclesiastical records have built the skeleton fabric of a Marston biography. Some new facts can be added after an examination of other records, notably those of an Inn of Court, of the diocese of Oxford, and of the College of Arms. From such an examination it will be seen that Marston was a member of the Middle Temple from *circa* 1594 to 1606; that towards the end of 1609 he was ordained deacon and priest in a parish church in Oxfordshire, and was in residence at an Oxford Hall and a reader in the Bodleian Library; and further—though these are two isolated facts of a different interest—that in August 1616 he was the victim of a highway robbery, while in 1624 his only son died in infancy.

I.

Grosart² was the first to conjecture that Marston had at one time undertaken law studies and having found them distasteful had abandoned them. His conjecture was based on a passage in the will of Marston's father (now used for the first time) wherein the latter bequeaths 'to s^d son John my furniture &c. in my chambers in the Middle Temple my law books &c. to my s^d son whom I hoped would have profited by them in the study of the law but man proposeth and God disposeth.' Grosart might have been more definite, for he reprints

¹ Dates in this article are given according to modern reckoning.

² *Poems of John Marston*, 1879 (vol. xi of Grosart's *Occasional Issues*), Biographical Introduction.

the burial notice of the dramatist from the Temple Church registers where Marston is described as a 'minister, sometimes of the Middle Temple.'

Grosart was followed without additions by Bullen and generally by others down to Sir E. K. Chambers¹. But in 1892 Foster², in his brief notes on Marston, mentions that he was a student of the Middle Temple in 1592 and 1601. Foster had previously compiled a manuscript index to the Inns of Court registers and was probably using information from them.

The Middle Temple records have been accessible in a translated and printed form since 1904³. Reference to them brings to light several interesting facts. On 2 August 1592 was admitted to the Society 'Mr. John, son and heir-apparent of John Marston of Coventry, esq., specially, by Mr. Marston, his father, Reader'—when, according to the second assumption, Marston had been for six months a member of the University of Oxford. It will be noted that the admission was a 'special' one granted during his father's term of office as Reader and probably according to the privileges of that office. It is almost certain that Marston did not enter into residence in the Middle Temple until he had completed his university course in Lent 1594. The first sign of his residence appears in 1595 when, on 20 November, Thomas Greene of Warwick, a newly admitted member, was 'Bound with Messrs John Marston of the Bench and John his son.' Marston can be traced at the Middle Temple in the years 1595, 1596, 1597, 1599, 1600, 1601 and 1606. His various changes of lodging are noted since each has to have the sanction of the Middle Temple parliament, and the names of those with whom he shared a chamber are disclosed. A minute of a parliament held on 27 November 1601 records that 'Mr. John Marston, who was expelled on 14 October last for non-payment of commons and other causes, is restored to the Fellowship and his antiquity, but restoration to his chamber will be further considered.' The last entry concerning him occurs after the minutes of a parliament held on 21 November 1606. A Mr Robert Weevil was given permission to move to the chamber of Henry Haule, Esq., Treasurer, and Mr John Marston 'in place of the latter, who forfeited for discontinuance.'

Marston, then, on his first admission to the Middle Temple probably shared the chamber of his father. It is interesting to note that this

¹ A. H. Bullen, *Works of John Marston*, 1887, Introd., vol. I, and *D.N.B.* article, 1893; Sir E. K. Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, III, p. 427.

² *Alumni Oxonienses*, 1892, vol. III.

³ *The Middle Temple Records*, ed. by C. H. Hopwood.

chamber with other buildings was built in 1577 at the cost of Marston senior and another and consisted of the 'chamber,' probably held in common, with a study and bedchamber on the north side and another study and bedchamber on the south. However, in 1597, Marston senior migrated from his own chamber to another, possibly more commodious, where he was rejoined by his son who, sometime late in 1595 or early in 1596, had come under the tutorship of John Armitage¹. After his father's death in November 1599, Marston surrendered his interest in his father's chamber which was taken over by Henry Haule, Esq., and Mr Deeringe. Marston himself joined Mr Osborne² in Mr Haule's old chamber. But in February 1601 Marston changed places with Deeringe and probably remained with Haule³ until his final forfeiture of rooms in 1606.

Stow⁴ gives a short and general but fairly adequate account of legal education at the end of the sixteenth century:

there is in and about this Citie, a whole Uniuersitie, as it were, of students, practisers or pleaders and Judges of the lawes of this realme, not liuing of common stipends, but of their owne priuate maintenance, as being altogether fed either by their places, or practise, or otherwise by their proper reuenue, or exhibition of parents & friends: for that the yonger sort are either gentlemen, or the sons of gentlemen, or of other most welthie persons.

The houses of Court bee replenished partly with young studentes, and partly with graduates and practisers of the law; but the Inns of Chancery⁵, being subordinate to the Inns of Court, are chiefly filled with officers, attorneys, solicitors and clerks; and yet there want not some other, being young students that come thither sometimes from one of the Uniuersities, and sometimes immediately from Grammar schooles, and these hauing spent sometime in studying vpon the first elements and grounds of the lawe, and hauing performed the exercises of their own houses (called *Bollas Mootes*, and putting of cases) they proceed to be admitted, and become students in some of these foure houses or Innes of Court, where continuing by the space of seuen yeares, or thereabouts, they frequent readings, meetings, boltinges⁶ and other learned exercises whereby growing ripe in the knowledge of the lawes, and approued withall to be of honest conuersation, they are either by the generall

¹ Admitted to the Society, 19 October 1566—some four years before Marston senior (7 May 1570).

² Admitted 12 January 1593; a rising young lawyer called to the Bar in 1602.

³ Admitted 2 December 1571; and for many years holder of the high office of Treasurer.

⁴ *A Survey of London*. Reprinted from the text of 1603 with introduction and notes by C. L. Kingsford, 1908, pp. 78-9.

⁵ New Inn was the Inn of Chancery subordinate to the Middle Temple. Marston's father was there before passing to the Temple, but it is highly unlikely that Marston himself was ever at New Inn.

⁶ 'Moots' were exercises in the nature of formal discussions and debates on points of law, raised by the students and conducted under the supervision of a benchor and two barristers as judges. 'Bolts' or 'boltings' were exercises similar to 'moots' but considered inferior. 'Readings' were of great importance because of the exhaustive and learned way in which the subject—a statute or section of a statute—was treated. The 'reader' was put to much expense and lavish hospitality during the three weeks and three days of the 'reading,' for the nobility of the realm, judges, bishops and even royalty, were invited to attend.

consent of the Benchers, or Readers, being of the most auncient, graue, and iudiciall men of euerie Inne of the Court, or by the speciall priuiledge of the present reader there, selected and called to the degree of *Viter Barresters*, and so enabled to be common counsellors, and to practise the law, both in their chambers, and at the Barres.

A further step in preferment is to become a Master of the Bench. The Benchers are self-elected and from their number each year are chosen two Readers, one to read in Lent and one in August.

The Masters of the Bench of an Inn of Court enjoyed practically unlimited authority therein but their influence was usually restricted to regulating admissions and callings to the bar, and to the exercise of discipline. There were regulations as to the dress, manners, morals, and religious observances of the members, but these regulations at the end of the sixteenth century seem not to have been rigorously enforced. Marston's father when an Utter Barrister was fined for absence from a 'reading' and 'put out of commons' for contravening a Privy Council order (of the sixteenth year of Queen Elizabeth's reign) regulating chapel attendance¹. However, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries successful barristers became less and less able and willing to devote their energies to the well-being of their profession as a whole and the corporate life of the Inns decayed. But in the modern semblance of collegiate discipline at the Inns are some survivals from Elizabethan times. The members of an Inn dine together in hall; the gates of the Inn are closed at night; and the old custom of a student reading for a year or more in the chambers of a practising barrister is still frequently maintained².

Something then of Marston's life at the Middle Temple during the probable period 1594-1606 may be pieced out. During the law terms he was in residence at the Inn sharing a chamber with his father or Mr Armitage or Mr Haule. He probably attended chapel prayers and the two 'readings' a year, read more or less in the law, and generally conformed to Middle Temple discipline. From his father's will (proved 29 November 1599) he seems not to have profited by his law studies and there is no record of his ever having been called to the bar. But Marston must have found law-term life at the Middle Temple congenial or at least convenient, and it may be that he took an interest in the side activities of the Inn. On the ancient authority of Fortescue we have it that students of the Inns of Court, in addition to their studies in law and divinity, learned to dance, sing and play instrumental music.

¹ Minute of a parliament, 13 May 1580.

² See, generally, the introduction to the edition of the Middle Temple records and the articles in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* on *Inns of Court* and *Legal Education*.

So came about the masques and revels of the law societies in Elizabethan and Jacobean times. The Inner Temple and Gray's Inn were more famed for their social entertainments than the Middle Temple and Lincoln's Inn¹.

II.

Grosart, judging from Marston's bequest in his will to the parish church of Christchurch, Hampshire, made several near guesses at the probable course of Marston's life: that after the final 'surcease' of his literary work in 1607 Marston took up studies preparatory to entering the ministry; that, as he married Mary, daughter of Dr Wilkes, rector of Barford St Martin in Wiltshire, he assisted Wilkes as curate and that later he became curate (or incumbent) of the church of Christchurch. These guesses were confirmed. Among nine documents connected with the *Keysar v. Burbage* case of Feb.-June 1610 (printed in 1910 by Professor C. W. Wallace²) is an affidavit of Cuthbert Burbage's of 18 June 1610 in which he includes among the witnesses whom he intends to call, 'John Marston of Barford in the county of wiltes clerk.' Bullen was able to convert more of these conjectures into facts. From the Dean and Chapter of Winchester he obtained the dates of Marston's presentation to and resignation of the living of Christchurch, and from the Record Office the date of his composition for First Fruits³. There the facts have stood since, with the corollary that sometime before 1616 Marston entered holy orders.

From the register of the Bishop of Oxford it is found that a John Marston, B.A., of Brasenose College was ordained deacon on 24 September 1609 in the parish church of Stanton Harcourt, Oxfordshire, by the then Bishop of Oxford, John Bridges⁴. From the absence of contradictory evidence in University and College registers, this John Marston would

¹ See the *Encyclopædia Britannica* article on *Inns of Court* and the reference there to Fortescue's *De Laudibus Legum Angliæ* ed. by A. Amos, 1825.

The wider questions of Marston's probable movements during the years before and after his 'tutorial' stage at the Middle Temple cannot be dealt with here, as neither can those interesting points about Marston's courtier-like ability to dance and sing (the lawyer Manningham's evidence and perhaps some personal references in contemporary drama show this), his fondness for music (perhaps shown in his satires and throughout his plays), and his interest in masques and entertainments (exhibited in his part of a London pageant, 1606, and in his *Ashby Entertainment*, c. 1607, if not in the *Mountebank's Masque*).

² *University Studies*, publ. by the University of Nebraska, vol. x, pp. 359-60.

³ Presented to the living—10 Oct. 1616. Compounded for First Fruits—12 Feb. 1617. Resigned—13 Sept. 1631.

⁴ Vol. II of the register, leaf 36 recto: the fourth entry under 'Diaconi';—inspected at the Diocesan Registry, Oxford, by kind permission and help of Mr E. A. Bacon, the assistant registrar.

appear to be the same John Marston who took his degree by 'determination' in 1594 from Brasenose College, who was almost certainly the John Marston matriculated a member of the University from Brasenose College in February 1592, and assumed to be the dramatist.

On 24 December 1609, a John Marston, B.A., of St Mary Hall was ordained priest in the same parish church of Stanton Harcourt by the same Bishop of Oxford¹. Dr W. J. Oldfield, who compiled a manuscript index to the Oxford episcopal registers, identifies the two Marstons probably on the grounds of ordinary clerical procedure and there is hardly a possibility of his being in error². At least two other Oxford men ordained deacon with the Brasenose College Marston were ordained priest with the St Mary Hall Marston. Moreover, handwriting evidence is available and helpful. Marston, at each of his ordinations, subscribed to the Thirty Nine Articles in a book³ specially kept for the purpose, and a comparison of the handwriting of the two brief Latin statements and signatures⁴ leaves little doubt of the identity of the two writers.

Thus it would appear that Marston for his studies preparatory to the ministry returned to Oxford and entered this time at St Mary Hall, in those days one of the flourishing halls of the University specially favoured by theological students⁵. His admission probably took place soon after 24 September 1609, and at any rate before 7 December of that year, for, as examples might show, the episcopal registers are very accurate in matters of change of degrees and so possibly in other *minutiæ*.

Marston evidently made use of the Bodleian Library, for on 7 December 1609, John Marston, B.A., of St Mary Hall was granted permission to

¹ Vol. II, leaf 42 recto: the ninth entry under 'Presbyteri.'

² Dr Oldfield had a copy of his manuscript *Index to the Clergy...in the Diocesan Registers of the Diocese of Oxford* made for the Bodleian Library in 1915.

³ A paper book with vellum cover entitled in a later hand *Liber Subscriptionum Clericorum* 1605-1635. This, with other documents, was sent from the Diocesan Registry to the Bodleian Library in 1915. A bound Subscription Book containing entries before 1607 and after 1619 is still at the Registry.

⁴ The first statement and signature is the second entry under 'Diaconi' for the date 24 Sept. 1609, on leaf 14 recto. The three lines of Latin and the signature are in a fine, thin Italian hand. The second statement and signature is the fourth entry under 'Presbyteri' for 24 Dec. 1609, on leaf 17 recto. The two lines and one word of Latin and the signature are in similarly formed but larger and thicker handwriting.

It is interesting to note that there are in Oxford three, almost certainly autograph, signatures of John Marston of Brasenose College; the first, 1592, in the university *Book of Subscriptions* on matriculation (Univ. Oxon. Arch. A. 6. 1—under the date 4 Feb. 1591/2); the second and third, 1609, in the *Liber Subscriptionum Clericorum*.

⁵ Few, if any, records of St Mary Hall are to be found, and references to it are scattered and fragmentary (see Anthony à Wood, *Colleges and Halls of Oxford*, and Sir Chas. Mallet, *History of the University of Oxford*, vols. I and II). Ralph Braddyll, M.A., of Brasenose College, became principal of the Hall in 1591 and was buried in St Mary's Church, 14 May 1632.

use the library by grace of Congregation¹. Not being a Master of Arts or a Doctor in a Faculty, he had to obtain leave.

III.

It is probable that Marston was a victim of highway robbery and assault in August 1616 for no records are known of another 'John Marston gentleman' of that time. The record² of the indictment is interesting for the inventory of Marston's pilfered 'good chattels and moneys.'

In August 1616, Sir George Sandes, late of Knightsbridge, was indicted on four charges of robbery and assault. The third of these is as follows:

Also, on the same file, a True Bill against the same Sir George Sandes knt., for assaulting John Marston gentleman in the same highway of Knightsbridge on the same aforesaid 10th of August 14 James I., and robbing him of a blacke roned gelding worth ten pounds, a greene saddle worth ten shillings, a bridle worth sixpence, a silke purse worth two shillings and eight-pence, a handkerchief worth a shilling, a sword worth three shillings, a paire of hangers worth five shillings, a ridinge coate worth twenty shillings, a taffeta hatt worth four shillings, *et duas pecias auri voc' King James vnites* worth forty and four shillings, a piece of gold worth ten shillings and sixpence, and eighteen shillings in numbered moneys of the good chattels and moneys of the said John Marston.

To each of the four charges Sir George Sandes pleaded not guilty and was acquitted.

IV.

Because there was no mention of children either in Marston's will or in his wife's will, it has been generally assumed that their marriage was childless³. The following copy of Marston's funeral certificate⁴, preserved at the College of Arms, speaks for itself and fixes other information more authoritatively.

¹ From the original registers of Congregation—reference to which was kindly undertaken by Mr Strickland Gibson, Deputy-Keeper of the Archives. Clark, in his list of persons using the Bodleian Library (*Register of the Univ. of Oxford*, 1887, vol. II, pt I, p. 267), describes Marston as of St Edmund Hall probably through a misreading of the blurred abbreviated Latin name.

² *Middlesex County Records*, edited by John Cordy Jeaffreson, vol. II, p. 125.

³ It is to be noted that one of the heraldic manuscripts in the British Museum—Harl. 2134, fo. 184 verso—describes Marston as of some place unmentioned in Hampshire who married 'Mary da: of Doctor Wilks' and 'dyde wthout yssue.'

⁴ Funeral Certificate, I, 24, 24 b, printed, but without direct reference to authority, in *Miscellanea Genealogica et Heraldica*, ed. Joseph Jackson Howard, 1884, vol. IV, new series, p. 55.

By order of the Earl Marshal, 18 July 1568, deaths of gentry were to be registered at the College of Arms and funeral certificates made out. This practice, more or less carelessly observed, continued until the close of the seventeenth century.

Mr John Marston of Couentry sonne of John Marston of the same place in the county of Warwick Gent. and Councillor at lawe sometyme of the Middle Temple London died in Aldermanbury at his house there on the 25th daye of June 1634 & was conveyed from thence to the Middle Temple where in the Quier of the Temple Church he lyeth interred by his father. He married Mary the sole da. of W^m Wilkes D^r of Divinity of Barford St Martins in y^e county of Wilts by whom he had only one sonne named John which died an infant 1624. The said defunct left for his executrix Mary his wife who gaue relacon of the truth of this Certificate which was taken by me William Penson Lancaster herauld on the 18 day of August following to be recorded in the office of Armes.

R. E. BRETTL.

OXFORD.

BUNYAN'S MR IGNORANCE

Pilgrim's Progress, as an expression of the Christian life in its relation to the world, constitutes not only a great religious document but also a survey of the intellectual attitudes and tendencies of the various social groups of Bunyan's generation. The allegory underlying such figures as Pope and Pagan¹ is obvious; and Christian himself—with Faithful and Hopeful to express auxiliary phases—is clearly an embodiment of Bunyan's own thoroughgoing Calvinism, with its insistence on Original Sin, Predestination, and Salvation by Faith alone. This was the theology that had dominated England during the Commonwealth and that, even after the Restoration, was still powerful among the middle classes, both Low Church Anglicans and Dissenters².

Bunyan's creed was definite and final, and brooked no opposition³. Indeed, he did not even spare a sect within his own theological pale: and, like Milton, he attacked the Presbyterians who had made themselves particularly unpopular in England during the Commonwealth. Hold-the-World, Money-Love, and Save-All, who came from 'Lovegain, which is a market-town in the country of coveting in the north [Scotland],' had apparently stigmatized men of Bunyan's stamp as 'righteous overmuch,' and are in return accused of assuming 'a guise of religion⁴,' of being hypocritical, stingy and sinfully tolerant, in their effort to accommodate the Christian life to the more comfortable service of Mammon⁵.

Neither the Presbyterians, however, nor the Independents had been strong enough to rule by force or tactful enough to rule by policy. The Restoration brought back the Cavaliers, and witnessed the gradual accomplishment of a compromise affected politically by the scheme of Cabinet Government, religiously in the progressive alleviation of dis-

¹ *Pilgrim's Progress*, ed. Lewis, New York, 1907, p. 76. He also refers to Roman Catholicism as 'the ware of Rome' (p. 105) and perhaps also as 'Hypocrisy' (p. 45).

² Arber points out, in his preface to the *Term Catalogues* of the Restoration, the preponderance of religious authors, of whom the nonconformists Baxter and Bunyan were especially popular.

³ Cf. Bunyan on By-Ends (secret purposes), pp. 120 *et seq.*

⁴ *Pilgrim's Progress*, pp. 119-20. This description savours of the attacks on the Scots by Churchill and his fellow-Whigs a century later.

⁵ Bunyan had tolerance not even for the worldly virtues, for the bourgeois thrift of Save-All (pp. 119 *et seq.*), or for the domestic ties that Christian had outraged at the start by deserting wife and children. Morality is stigmatized as the locality where Worldly Wiseman goes to church, and 'custom' and 'legality' appear as the underlying philosophy of Formalist and Hypocrisy (pp. 45-6). All natural impulses are utterly corrupt; and men's hearts 'are deceitful above all things and desperately wicked' (p. 102).

abilities laid on Dissenters¹, philosophically in Locke's *Letters on Tolerance*² and in the newly prominent theory of the social contract. In this era of compromise, the social groundwork of rising Neo-classicism, Bunyan passed his later life; and his general impression of it he depicted in the description of Vanity Fair. Its religious ideal, the Established Church, he seems to have satirized in the person of Formalism³. Its cultural ideal, the well-rounded gentleman acting in accordance with the Aristotelian doctrine of the mean, is summarized in Mr Worldly Wiseman, a 'gentleman' of the city of Carnal Policy⁴, who is quite consumed with worldly cares, who looks on excess of religion as insanity, and who is described as having a 'carnal temper.' Mr Legality, to whom he directs Christian to have his burden of sin removed, is called a 'cheat'; and his son, Civility, a 'hypocrite.' Worldly Wiseman, furthermore, urges Christian to send for his wife and children and come to live in the town of Morality 'in credit and good fashion'; but, when the pilgrim starts to follow this advice, Mount Sinai, the Law of God, almost overwhelms him⁵. The intellectual ideals of the age, moreover, the interest in physical science that was expressing itself in the discoveries of Newton, Boyle and others of the Royal Society, seemed to Bunyan inessential to Salvation, and therefore sinfully trivial; Faithful rebukes Talkative for his delight in pure learning: '...he seeketh knowledge, he cheweth upon the word;... he parteth not with the way of sinners...'; and Faithful condemns 'bare speculation' as opposed to 'that knowledge that is accompanied with the grace of faith and love⁶.' In short, Bunyan represents the Reformation at war with the Renaissance, with its social urbanity and with its urge for intellectual progress.

¹ The beginning of Dissent as a recognized body outside the Church of England may be dated from the Corporation Act of 1661 and the Savoy Conference of 1662, after which some two thousand Baptist and Independent ministers, who refused episcopal ordination, were dispossessed of their livings. At first serious disabilities were laid upon them; but, even during the reign of Charles II, there was some beginning of religious compromise in a series of legislative Acts that weakened the powers and prerogatives of the Establishment (Buckle, *History of Civilization*, New York, 1894, I, 276 *et seq.*); and during the reign of William and Mary, the position of Dissenters considerably improved.

² Even before Locke's *Letters*, tolerance had been urged by Dissenter and Anglican alike: in Milton's *Areopagitica*, in Taylor's *Liberty of Prophesying*, and in Chillingworth as early as 1638. Locke, however, as the basis of the political and religious policy of the Whig party for the hundred years following, was the most influential author.

³ *Pilgrim's Progress*, p. 45. He apparently refers but little, probably for reasons of prudence, to the Church of England. Bunyan would doubtless have looked upon Evelyn, the finished Renaissance gentleman, sincerely religious but inimical to all enthusiasm, as belonging to the class of Worldly Wiseman.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 17 *et seq.*

⁵ Bunyan is sceptical not only of the trammels of morality but also of too great liberty of action. He favours 'a tender conscience' and disapproves of 'hectoring liberty' (pp 84-5).

⁶ *Pilgrim's Progress*, pp. 94 *et seq.* Bunyan is, however, willing to have the pilgrims use a telescope for purely religious purposes such as viewing the Celestial City (p. 145).

Of all contemporary comment in *Pilgrim's Progress*, however, the most significant is that concerning Mr Ignorance. Just as knowledge for its own sake is to be despised, so a repudiation of its right use as a means of Salvation is to be abhorred. Grace and the Truth that gives Faith will save us; but these are bestowed from above: let him beware who supposes that they naturally reside within his own capabilities, and who therefore refuses to enter the Way through the Gate of Baptism. Mr Ignorance has no sense of sin or of holy fear. He is an emotionalist, and trusts to his heart, not to the Bible interpreted through his reason. He comes from the 'country of Conceit'; and, 'walking down a little crooked lane,' joins Christian and Hopeful on their pilgrimage. They ask him why he did not come in at the Gate [baptism]; and he replies that he trusts in Good Works: he has led a good life, prayed, fasted, and given alms. Christian rebukes him for his self-sufficiency, and says that he will probably be damned. To this he answers: '...be content to follow the religion of your country and I will follow the religion of mine, tolerance. I hope all will be well [optimism]¹. And as for the gate that you talk of, all the world knows that it is a great way off of our country. I cannot think that any man in all our parts doth so much as know the way to it, nor need they matter whether they do or no, since we have, as you see, a fine, pleasant green lane [easy and agreeable religion], that comes down from our country....' Thereupon Christian and Hopeful leave him, and remark one to another that he cannot receive Salvation. The *libido sentiendi* and the *libido sciendi* alike affect damnation.

Later in their journey² they wait for him to catch up with them; and there ensues an extended theological controversy. Hopeful starts by enquiring why he stays behind; and Ignorance says that he prefers to 'walk alone' [individualism]. They ask after the state of his soul; and he replies: 'I hope well; for I am always full of good motions....' They enquire the ground for this optimism; he replies that his 'motions' are a desire within him for God and heaven; and they retort that the devils in hell have such a desire. Ignorance then advances another argument: he has forsaken all to follow God. They ask him how he knows that he is following God; and he replies: 'My heart tells me so,' and shortly adds that his heart is 'a good one'; and, on being asked to prove this latter assertion, he once more calls attention to the rectitude of his life. Christian then asks him how he knows that his life is righteous;

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 146-7. Bunyan's side-note on this speech is: 'He saith to everyone that he is a fool.'

² *Ibid.*, pp. 172 et seq.

and Ignorance, arguing quite blindly in a circle, says that his heart tells him so. Christian then tries to convince him that his heart is bad, and launches forth upon the doctrine of Original Sin; but he professes horror of Redemption by Christ's sacrifice alone¹; and, after a somewhat acid dialogue in which they still press him for proofs in revelation, and in which he remarks that he does not believe in the revelations personally vouchsafed to them, he again falls behind, and does not reappear in the narrative until at the end he is bound and carried to hell while Christian and Hopeful enter the Celestial City.

Ignorance is clearly a disciple of Natural Religion², of which Deism was the most characteristic current phase. The two cardinal articles of his belief may be summarized as an humanitarian faith in justification by philanthropic works and a sentimental faith in the innate goodness of his heart. Technical theology he neither understands nor reverences; but he favours a vague tolerance for all opinions. Of his own eternal happiness he is assured by his good deeds and his exalted heart. As in Bunyan's later contemporary, Lord Shaftesbury, Ignorance, once freed by the deistic tendencies of his time from a pessimistic view of human nature, renounces the old theology with all its ethical and metaphysical implications, and embraces a 'new ethics' of optimism and emotion, an ethics that can best be described as essentially Sentimental³.

In depicting Ignorance, Bunyan may have had in mind the newly risen sect of Quakers. That he bitterly hated them is well known; and the tracts he wrote against them suggest that he would have defined their shortcomings as somewhat similar to those of Ignorance⁴: like Ignorance, they repudiated Calvinism; and, until in the early eighteenth century they changed to their present-day quietism, the tone of their

¹ *Pilgrim's Progress*, p. 176.

² Christian refers to Ignorance as a person religiously 'in a natural condition' (p. 174). Natural Religion had appeared sporadically in several thinkers earlier in the century, e.g. Spinoza and Lord Herbert of Cherbury.

³ On this 'new ethics,' see E. Bernbaum, *Drama of Sensibility*, ch. I. The present writer does not contend that Sentimentalism is either a necessary or a logical outgrowth of Calvinism. Culture history does not evolve according to the rules of formal logic. Doubtless several causes combined both to break down Calvinism and to substitute this particular point of view in its stead. The discovery of scientific law in the realms of physics and astronomy, where previously miracle had been supposed to rule, was a serious blow to Calvinism; it intellectualized religion, and largely checked the use of prayer as an emotional outlet. After 1688 the rise to wealth and power of the merchant classes through foreign trade induced a new optimism; and the intellectualizing of religion resulted in the use of the arts in the following century as an expression of emotional optimism.

⁴ See *Some Gospel Truths* and *A Vindication of Some Gospel Truths* (Bunyan, *Works*, London, 1859, I, pp. 77 *et seq.* and pp. 87 *et seq.*). A similar charge was sometimes preferred against all Dissenters. See *Odes and Elegies upon Divine and Moral Subjects*, London, 1698, p. 37 *et passim*. The Quakers were, however, especially liable to it. The Anglican Evelyn credits them with Sentimental traits, calling them 'phrantic,' individualistic, 'melancholy, proud sort of people' and 'exceedingly Ignorant' (*Diary*, July 8, 1656).

meetings was highly 'enthusiastic,' indeed, not unlike the revivalism of the early Methodists¹. In fact, had Bunyan intended Ignorance specifically to typify the Quakers, he would surely have laid more stress on his unrestrained emotionalism. Bunyan, moreover, must have had a much larger body in mind than this small and bitterly persecuted sect, for, in describing his native town, Vanity Fair², Hopeful declared that there were an 'abundance...in his [Ignorance's] condition, whole families; yea, whole streets and that of pilgrims [Calvinists] too³.' This heresy must have deceived many of the very Elect. Bunyan was undoubtedly in a position to know the facts concerning the religious movements of his time; and, if one takes Hopeful's statement seriously, one is compelled to infer that Deism and at least the beginnings of Sentimentalism were becoming widespread in the social strata that Bunyan knew.

The foregoing theory happily agrees with the generally recognized Calvinism of the early seventeenth-century bourgeoisie, and with their Sentimentalism a hundred years later, as evidenced by the bourgeois drama and the Richardsonian novel. Indeed, the fact that Sentimentalism was already widespread among Bunyan's class when *Pilgrim's Progress* was being composed in the 1670's is full of significance in literary history: it explains the 'tremendous'⁴ and 'immediate'⁵ success of Cibber's *Love's Last Shift* in 1696; and it explains the earlier, sporadic occurrence of Sentimentalism that, in Realistic drama, is usually associated with middle-class life⁶.

After parting with Ignorance, the other two proceed to discuss him and his kind; and there follows Bunyan's psychological explanation of the rise of Sentimentalism⁷. Christian explains that such men as Ignorance lack holy fear; for they have not heeded the 'convictions of sin' that conscience has given them⁸. This inattention to the call of conscience is based on one of four reasons: they think that such fears are 'wrought

¹ The 'enthusiasm' of the early Quakers is commonly recognized by the historians of the sect such as Sewell, Harvey and Braithwaite. The change to quietism early in the eighteenth century is ascribed to increased toleration.

² *Pilgrim's Progress*, p. 163.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 178. Indeed, Hopeful himself was once of this persuasion (p. 180). The present writer interprets 'pilgrim' as Calvinist, partly because Hopeful would hardly be so deeply concerned about disaffection among persons who were already in error, and partly because Christian and Hopeful seem to derive Sentimentalism from the Calvinistic point of view (pp. 178 *et seq.*).

⁴ J. W. Krutch, *Comedy and Conscience after the Restoration*, New York, 1924, p. 203.

⁵ E. Bernbaum, *The Drama of Sensibility*, Boston, 1915, p. 77.

⁶ See Bernbaum, *op. cit.*, pp. 37 *et seq.*; Krutch, *op. cit.*, pp. 153 *et seq.*; and *Modern Language Notes*, xli, pp. 332 *et seq.*

⁷ *Pilgrim's Progress*, pp. 178 *et seq.*

⁸ Bunyan (*Works*, ed. *cit.*, i, p. 410) gives failure to recognize one's own Original Sin as the chief cause for men's refusal to accept the Gospel.

by the devil'; they suppose that the fears 'tend to the spoiling of their faith'; they 'presume that they ought not to fear; and therefore, in despite of them, wax presumptuously confident'; and lastly, 'they see that those fears tend to take away from them their pitiful old self-holiness, and therefore they resist them with all their might.'

Bunyan had too deep a knowledge of human nature in general and of religious experience in particular for the historian to ignore this psychological analysis. The first two reasons are obvious enough, and seem really to embody only one explanation; they spring from the conscious mind rather than the sub-conscious, and in most persons would probably be a mere rationalization, or justification, of an attitude the real causes of which lay deeper. The third reason seems more significant: since fear is repulsive to the mind, many people involuntarily protect themselves against it by a studied self-deceit. Certainly it is true that fear of damnation was intensely real to such sensitive souls as the poet Cowper, and seems to have contributed to his loss of mental balance. In East Anglia, moreover, where Calvinism was particularly strong, suicide from such a motive was not uncommon¹. The sub-conscious reaction toward Sentimental optimism, chronicled by Bunyan, is doubtless a psychological self-protection quite natural to many minds that cannot endure contemplating the probability of their own eternal damnation.

The fourth reason that Bunyan assigns seems supplementary to the one preceding. 'Conviction of sin' not only plunges one into fears that are painful, and therefore to be suppressed, but also destroys our intensely agreeable faith in our own excellence, the 'pitiful self-holiness' to which he refers. The destruction of this faith is liable to sap self-reliance and paralyse assertive action; and doubtless for this reason Nature has made the generality of mankind cling to it as tenaciously as to any other life-preserving force. It is, therefore, the dislike of fear and the will to self-approbation that, according to Bunyan, gave rise to Sentimentalism. There were doubtless other occasional causes, besides the permanent ones grounded in human nature that Bunyan assigns; but the significant thing concerning his psychological analysis is that it is meaningless unless one supposes that the individual who is becoming a Sentimentalist had either formerly embraced Calvinism or at least has come strongly under its influence. Bunyan's theory, for instance, would clearly not apply to the godless courtiers of Charles II, who were appa-

¹ See the present author's *William Mason*, New York, 1924, p. 131 and note. Bunyan himself had been much troubled by this problem (*Grace Abounding*, paragraph 57, etc.).

rently untroubled either by 'pitiful self-holiness' or by 'convictions of sin.' Bunyan, it seems fair to suppose, is referring to the Calvinistic bourgeois among whom he moved and whose mental processes he knew. It seems, therefore, difficult to avoid the conclusion that Bunyan, in the person of Mr Ignorance, is expressing the evolution of bourgeois thought of the late seventeenth century from Calvinism to Deism and Sentimentalism¹.

JOHN W. DRAPER.

OBONO, MAINE, U.S.A.

¹ Rousseau's religious evolution would seem to support this theory. Lecky, moreover, refers to him as 'preaching a kind of belated and distorted Puritanism' (*History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, New York, 1893, vi, p. 265).

THE TEXT OF COWPER'S 'LETTERS'

THE text of Cowper's letters is in such an incomplete, corrupt and muddled state that anyone who has occasion to go beyond a popular selection, whether for pleasure or for purposes of study, must soon find how little any of the four collected editions is to be trusted. The earliest of these collections is Hayley's, published as part of his *Life of Cowper*, 2 vols., 1803, and added to in further volumes which appeared in 1804 and 1806. Hayley gives a numbered series of 458 letters and quotes from 27 others in the narrative parts of his biography. He was hampered by the conditions imposed on him by the owners of the letters and by his own desire to show Cowper in the most favourable light, so that he printed only a selection of the letters he had at his disposal, and those he did print are mostly mutilated. Sometimes he marks the omissions, but more often the remaining fragments are cleverly manipulated to give them a plausible appearance of continuity, and he even on occasion combines two letters into one. His work is full of misprints, and the later editions differ so much among themselves that it is impossible to distinguish corrections from further errors.

The Private Correspondence of William Cowper, Esq., with several of his most intimate Friends, 1824, edited by John Johnson, Cowper's kinsman 'Johnny of Norfolk,' contains 223 letters, some of which had already been partly printed by Hayley. Johnson's intentions were on the one hand to illustrate Cowper's religious notions, which he thought had been inadequately represented by Hayley, and on the other hand to show him in more frivolous moods than Hayley had thought suitable for public contemplation. He omits personal criticisms, some domestic trivialities, and passages that are obviously symptomatic of religious mania.

Grimshawe's edition (1835) is a clumsy re-handling of Hayley's inspired by a ludicrous zeal for the interests of religion and morality. It includes nearly all the *Private Correspondence* and nearly all Hayley's letters, with about a dozen new ones. Southey's edition (1836) is also based on Hayley's, but with the addition of many new letters. The *Private Correspondence*, at first omitted, was added in a supplementary volume in 1837; the complete work contains 881 letters.

The latest and fullest edition is Mr Thomas Wright's (1904), containing according to his own summary 1041 letters, 753 being wholly from Southey and 51 from other published sources. Of the remaining 237,

105 were unpublished and 132 had been partly published. Mr Wright had seen the originals of about 400 letters and of these he has printed the complete text. Besides the universal taint of inaccuracy, this edition has a serious defect, less excusable in 1904 than in 1836, in that Mr Wright does not state which are the letters that he has compared with the originals. Consequently it is impossible to know except by private judgment whether a letter that he lists as from Southey is also known to him to be complete. Furthermore, when he marks a letter 'Southey, partially' he means sometimes that he has seen the full text and restored it, and sometimes merely that he has added an extract from a sale-catalogue.

Since 1904 two small collections have appeared—35 letters to Joseph Hill and John and Catharine Johnson in Mr John Bailey's edition of Cowper's poems (1905) and 31 to various correspondents in Mr Wright's *Unpublished and Uncollected Letters of Cowper*, 1925. Some of the letters in both collections had previously been printed in a mutilated form. There are also many letters wholly or partly in print and not included in any of the collections, and a very large number of unpublished or partly published ones in private hands, as any dealer's catalogue will show.

An example may be given of the sort of confusion that pervades all the collections, from the earliest to the latest. The *Unpublished and Uncollected Letters* includes one (no. 16) to Samuel Rose, dated, ostensibly on the authority of the original in the Cowper Museum at Olney, September 23, 1788. In it Cowper speaks of his work on the second edition of his *Homer* and of John Johnson's preaching. But the first edition of *Homer* did not appear till 1791, and Johnson, who was unknown to Cowper until 1790, was ordained in July 1793. Thus the date 1788 is five years too early. But this is not all—the paragraph relating to *Homer* was printed by Mr Wright in 1904 in another letter to Rose, dated May 5, 1793. This letter is derived through Southey from Hayley, who had altered the added paragraph to remove some discrepancies between it and the rest of the letter to which it is tacked on. No wonder that Cowper sometimes seems a creature of contrary moods.

The following letter (now in my possession), of which about a quarter has been published, is introduced here for the sake of comparison with previous editions, but it is of great intrinsic interest as the first that Cowper wrote to Hayley after the latter's visit to Weston in 1792. (See *The Life of William Cowper*, by Thomas Wright, 2nd edition, 1921, pp. 305-7.)

[No date. London postmark June 4.]

All's well.

Which words I place as conspicuously as possible and prefix them to my letter, to save you the pain, my friend and Brother, of a moment's anxious speculation. Poor Mary proceeds in her amendment still, and improves I think even at a swifter rate than when you left her. The stronger she grows the faster she gathers strength, which is perhaps the natural course of recovery. She waked so well this morning that she told me at my first visit she had entirely forgot her illness, and she spoke so distinctly and had so much her usual countenance that, had it been possible, she would have made me forget it too. Yesterday she moved into the electrifying room with very little help from her supporters, and carried herself more erect than at any time before. She seems however to have a better opinion of your spark-eliciting faculties than of mine, and once or twice was so riotous that I had much ado to manage her. She even had the hardness to tell me of your superior skill, and when the snaps were smart and frequent to say, Hayley would not do thus if *he* was here. The truth is, I believe, that her Feelings are quicker than they were, and that the inconvenience of which she complains is rather owing to the Patient's amendment than to any want of dexterity in the Agent. She bids me tell you that she loves you dearly, and that were you her brother she could not love you more. She is desirous too that you should know her own opinion of her disorder. She judges it to be a nervous rheumatism accompanied by those spasms to which she has so [page 2] many years been subject. Formerly they affected her bosom, and now she judges them to be the same that have seized her limbs. It is certain that they go and come, and that in the course of the same day her face is sometimes drawn aside and sometimes not, and that her speech varies in the same manner. Last night she enquired of Gregson if Steers' Opodeldoo might not be useful to her. He thought it might. Therefore having a little left at the bottom of a bottle that Lady Hesketh brought with her, she had it rubb'd into her back at bed-time, and it seems to have been of prodigious use to her. We can easily, I believe, get more of it at Northampton. She wishes much for an aperient electuary, and if Dr. Austen can prescribe one that will be effectual, will hold it a great additional obligation. Whether in prose or verse I shall always love and honour *him*, and so will Mary.

And now my dear fellow let me tell you how much we love you, and how much we have regretted you. We talk of you all the day long, and always say of you more than I will now tell you. Neither are we quite singular in this, for you have left a regret of you in the hearts of all our family and of all our visitors. Every creature is sorry that you are gone, only in this sorrow *we* claim the preeminence, having far most reason.

Here I shall leave a gap to be fill'd after the Post comes in, and proceed to sing you a song which you will find in the next page, and which would have been better had you been here to mend it.

— Return'd from my walk, blown to tatters and all in a dissolution. Found two dear things in the Study, your Letter and my Mary. She is bravely well, and your beloved epistle does us both good. How kind is Carwarden. Bless him, and tell him that I say so. As to your own kindness you shall hear no more about that from me, for the more I say of it, the more attentive you become to me, and the less to yourself. For instance, you would leave Murphy's book at last, though I said all I could to dissuade you from it, and now you will poison y^rself with the steams of old Babylon in hopes of doing me service. But beware, for [page 3] shouldst thou kill thyself in my cause, I shall never love thee after. I found your kind pencil-note in my song-book as soon as I came down on the Morning of your departure, and Mary was vex'd to the heart that the simpletons who watch'd her supposed her asleep when she was not, for she learn'd soon after you were gone that you would have peep'd at her had you known her to be awake. I perhaps might have had a peep too, and therefore was as vext as she. But if it please God we shall make ourselves large amends for all lost peeps by and by at Earham.—I have no doubt that all is well there, tho' you found no letter, but I wish you had found for your own peace' sake. Adieu. God be with you. Amen.

Sonnet.

Hayley—thy tenderness fraternal shown
 In our first interview, delightful guest!
 To Mary' and Me for her dear sake distress'd,
 Such as it is has made my heart thy own
 Though heedless now of new engagements grown;
 For threescore winters make a wintry breast,
 And I had purpos'd ne'er to go in quest
 Of Friendship more, except with God alone.
 But Thou hast won me. Nor is God my Foe,
 Who e're this last afflictive scene began
 Sent Thee to mitigate the dreadful blow
 My Brother, by whose sympathy I know
 Infallibly thy true deserts to scan,
 Not more t'admire the Bard, than love the Man.

W Cowper.

M^{rs}. Socket whom I told that I was writing to you, desires me to give her duty to ~~yr~~self and her love to M^{rs}. Mary and to her son. She has nothing to add, except that she is very well.

I shall long to hear from you, but would not worry you to write unless when you can find a tranquil moment, if such can be found in London.

[page 4]

To

William Hayley Esq^r. at
 George Romney's Esq^r.
 Cavendish Square.
 London.

The published versions of this letter are not extreme examples of editorial mangling, but they are bad enough. Hayley heads it 'Weston, June 3, 1792,' and prints 'All's well' in large italic capitals with a heavy line below. After putting 'walked' for 'waked' he goes on to omit, without any indication of the lacuna, everything between 'Yesterday she moved into the electrifying room' and 'had you been here to mend it.' Then the idea of an eminent poet returning from a mid-day walk in June puffing and blowing and streaming with perspiration struck him as unseemly, so he invented a high wind and altered the next passage to 'Returned from my walk, blown to tatters—found two dear things in the study,' etc. 'How kind is Carwarden' to 'never love thee after' had to go, but 'I found your kind pencil-note' down to 'by and by at Eartham' is admitted, with a clumsy correction in the name of the sequence of tenses to 'had you known her to have been awake.' All the rest of the letter is left out, and the fragments are rounded off with the plausible but quite unwarranted signature 'W. C.' Hayley's text is reprinted, incorrectly, by Southey, Grimshawe, and Mr Wright. By 1904, when Mr Wright's edition appeared, the date of the letter had changed to June 4, which is obviously wrong, as is shown by comparing it with the next letter to Hayley, June 5. 'All's well' has got on to the

same line as 'Which words'—it might easily have been more conspicuously prefixed. 'Had so much her usual countenance' is altered to 'had so much of her usual countenance.' The sonnet, apart from the punctuation, differs only in one point from the printed versions, where the thirteenth line reads 'Thy true deserts infallibly to scan.'

The whole series of letters to Hayley is particularly well adapted to serve as a criterion of the completeness of the text given in Mr Wright's edition. Neither Grimshawe nor Southey added anything to the text of these letters as printed by Hayley in 1803; it seems certain therefore that the originals were not accessible to them. Hayley's correspondence was sold in 1878; every letter from Cowper to him which had appeared in print before then can be identified in the catalogue of the sale, and every additional letter in Mr Wright's edition is also there, except the undated, unsigned fragment, no. 31 in his 1925 volume, which is known only from a copy by Hayley. The chances of any letters not in the catalogue being in existence are therefore very small. The letters in the catalogue are as follows:

| | | | |
|---------|----------------|----------|-----------------|
| 1. 1792 | March 17 h | 26. 1792 | November 25 h W |
| 2. | 24 w | 27. | December 7 w |
| 3. | April 6 h | 28. | 26 h W |
| 4. | 15 W | 29. 1793 | January 8 |
| 5. | May 1 W | 30. | 20 h |
| 6. | 9 W | 31. | 29 h W |
| 7. | June 3 h | 32. | February 24 h |
| 8. | 5 h | 33. | March 19 h W |
| 9. | 6 | 34. | April 1 |
| 10. | 7 h w | 35. | 23 h |
| 11. | 10 h W | 36. | May 21 h W |
| 12. | 14 | 37. | June 20 h |
| 13. | 19 h w | 38. | July 7 h |
| 14. | 23 W | 39. | 24 h W |
| 15. | 27 h | 40. | August 15 h W |
| 16. | July 4 h W | 41. | 27 h W |
| 17. | 15 h w | 42. | September 8 h W |
| 18. | 22 h | 43. | October 5 & 6 h |
| 19. | 29 h | 44. | 18 h |
| 20. | September 18 h | 45. | November 17 |
| 21. | 21 h | 46. | 22 W |
| 22. | October 2 h W | 47. | December 8 h W |
| 23. | 13 h w | 48. | 17 h W |
| 24. | 28 h w | 49. 1794 | January 5 h W |
| 25. | November 7 w | | |

h—incomplete version in Hayley.

W—printed apparently in full by Mr Wright (1904 or 1925).

w—fragment printed by Mr Wright.

(All the letters marked h are in Mr Wright's edition.)

The sale-catalogue gives no date for no. 7, and marks nb. 27 'N.D. (Dec. 7).'

Out of these forty-nine letters, Hayley prints partial versions of

thirty-six. These are all in the *Life of Cowper* except no. 1, which is in *Latin and Italian Poems of Milton.....translated by the late William Cowper, Esq.*, published by Hayley in 1808. A detached passage quoted by Hayley in the *Life* (1803, vol. 1, p. 7), and proved by the sale-catalogue to belong to no. 3, has escaped Mr Wright's attention. Mr Wright prints all Hayley's thirty-six letters, fifteen of them apparently in full, and five others with an additional paragraph. Out of these twenty, he inadvertently claims four (nos. 11, 13, 16, 26) as previously unpublished. As for the thirteen not printed by Hayley, Mr Wright has the full text of five and an extract from each of three others. Thus out of forty-nine letters in the catalogue, five are unpublished and only twenty published apparently in full.

K. POVEY.

PURLEY, SURREY.

RARE OR UNEXPLAINED WORDS IN THE ANGLO-NORMAN 'VOYAGE OF ST BRENDAN.' A CONTRIBUTION TO FRENCH LEXICOGRAPHY¹

CISLER, v.n. '(of wind) whistle, howl.'

v. 94 (describing Mernoc's voyage to an island near Paradise):

91 Quer puis devint en itel liu
U nuls n'entret fors sul li piu:
Ço fud en mer en un' isle
U mals orrez nuls ne cisle...

Variants to v. 94: D *U nul mal orez*, E *U nus ores nului*; B *ne cille*, E *n'escille*; in C the line is mostly illegible, but the last four letters are distinctly *ifle*, representing *cifle* or *sifle* (Suchier, p. 565, omitted to mention this variant).

Vising (*Étude*, p. 77) proposed to read *ille*: *eisille* with MS. E, although there is no other rhyme in the text indicating that *s* in *isle* could be mute. Bartsch translated *cisler* as 'tempêter,' which does not convey the correct shade of meaning. As pointed out by Calmund (p. 102), it corresponds to the O.Prov. verb *cisclar*, *gisclar*, *sisclar* 'crier à haute voix, pousser des cris aigus,' etc. (cf. Raynouard *sisclar*, *gisclamen*, Levy *cisclar*) and Mod.Prov. *ciscla*, *giscla*, etc. 'pousser des cris aigus,' 'siffler (en parlant du vent),' etc. To judge by the numerous variants, meanings and derivatives given in Mistral's *Tresor dóu Felibrige*, the word is very extensively used in Modern Provençal. In French-speaking Switzerland *cicler*, *sicler* 'crier d'une voix aiguë,' *ciclée*, *siclée* 'cri aigu et perçant' are still every-day words (cf. Pierrehumbert, *Dictionnaire historique du Parler Neuchâtelois et Suisse Romand*).

Meyer-Lübke, 3333, rightly hesitates to derive O.Prov. *cisclar* from *fistulare*. *Cisclar* and O.Fr. *cisler* are doubtless of onomatopoeic origin, from the sound of whistling, especially of whistling wind. It is tempting to derive Eng. *sizzle* 'to make a hissing sound' from Anglo-Norman *cisler*; but according to the *New Eng. Dict.* the word does not appear before 1600, and may therefore have arisen independently.

COSTIL, s.m. 'coast.'

v. 430 (God's messenger meets Brendan on the Isle of Sheep, and instructs him as to his future movements):

Puis revendrez, e sanz peril.
430 Bien pres siglant de cest costil.

¹ Continued from Vol. XXI, p. 403.

All four MSS. agree. L translates: *Dehinc autem juxta hanc terram transibis.*

The word still exists in French dialects (e.g. in the Channel Islands) in the sense of 'hill, hill-side,' and is found in this sense in O.Fr. (e.g. *Oxford Psalter*, ed. Michel, p. 249; *Gauvain*, v. 5562). Godefroy makes no distinction between the *Brendan* example and the rest; but here it can only mean 'coast, shore.' It is nowhere suggested that the Isle of Sheep, to which the word refers, is hilly.

For both meanings the etymology is the same, *costa* > *côte* signifying 'hill-side' as well as 'coast.' The suffix is not *-iculum* (Birkenhoff, p. 43) but *-île*, as in Lat. *ovile* 'sheepfold,' Fr. *courtil* 'garden,' *chenil* 'kennel,' etc.; cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Hist. französische Grammatik*, II, p. 43. In the *Brendan*, *l* and *l-mouillé* are combined in rhyme on several other occasions: *soleil* : *fedeil* 581-2, *travailz* : *calz* 1177-8, *peril* : *seril* 1309-10, *mil* : *peril* 1471-2, *soleil* : *peil* 1761-2.

CUNTRESAILIR, v. (+ dat.) 'rise up against.'

v. 977 (the voyagers, destitute of supplies, reach land but find themselves storm-bound):

Cum a terre ariverent,
Les tempestes aviverent;
975 Cunuit Brandans al air pluus
Que li tens ert mult annuus.
Li venz lur est cuntresailiz,
E li eunreiz lur est failiz.

All four MSS. agree in v. 977, except that A has *ert* (also in v. 978). L has: *His factis, tempestas aucta est, et ventus eis contrarius...procellam magnam injecit.*

The verb is not in Godefroy.

ESCHIPER, v.a. 'moor.'

v. 252 (the voyagers reach a rock-bound coast):

Terre veient grande e halte;
Li venz lur vient san defalte.
Qui de nager erent penét
250 Sanz tuz travailz la sunt menét,
Mais n'i truvent nul' entrethe
U lur nef fust eschipepe,
Quer de rocheiz ert aclose
U nul d'eals tuz munter n'ose.

Variants to v. 252: *fust*] D *poist estre*, E *fust bien*; C *achipe*, D *arivee*. L renders vv. 251-4: *sed ad eam nullus eis patebat accessus, quoniam terra procera supra mare fuerat.* The agreement of MSS. A, B and E authenticates *eschipepe*.

30 *Rare or Unexplained Words in the 'Voyage of St Brendan'*

The usual meaning of O.Fr. *eschiper* (inaccurately translated by Godefroy 'embarquer, faire embarquer') is 'to put out to sea,' in both transitive and reflexive uses of the verb. Bartsch, taking *just eschippede* in *Brendan* as representing a reflexive verb (with pronoun omitted in a compound tense), followed Godefroy and translated 's'embarquer.' But Mussafia, in *Romania*, XVIII, pp. 506-7, showed this translation to be unacceptable, as Brendan and his monks are seeking to land, not to put out to sea. Mussafia, while upholding the view that *just eschippede* was reflexive, interpreted the verb as equivalent to *approdare* 'to put to land.'

Probably neither of these explanations is correct. A comparison of the French text with the corresponding passage of the *Navigatio* suggests another solution. The author of the *Brendan* does not often follow the wording of his source at all closely, but here he has clearly rendered the words (ed. Wahlund, p. 14, line 1): *Minime potuerunt invenire portum ubi staret navis* (Schröder, p. 7, line 13, has *poterant* and *stetisset*). *Stare* is here used in the classical sense of 'to lie or ride at anchor' (cf. Lewis and Short). *Eschiper une nef* therefore signifies, in this passage at least, 'to cause a boat to ride at anchor' or 'to moor a boat'; in which case it still means 'to place on the sea,' though not 'to put out into the open sea.' This interpretation is fully borne out by the events which follow (vv. 261-5); the voyagers find a haven where there is just sufficient room for one boat to float, and there they moor their vessel. Thus there is no need to give *eschiper* (or *sei eschiper*?) the sense of 'to put to land,' of which no other instance is known.

The last word has not yet been said with regard to the etymology of *eschiper*. Meyer-Lübke (7997) derives it from Anglo-Saxon *skipan*; but this is surely an oversight, for no such word existed in Anglo-Saxon (cf. Bosworth and Toller). Old Norse *skipa* 'to equip' (cf. Cleasby and Vigfusson) will explain O.Fr. *esquiper* in the same sense, but not in the sense of 'to put out to sea.' Quite possibly two words, borrowed from different Germanic tongues, have coalesced in O.Fr. *esquiper*, *eschiper*. Seeing that O.Fr. *eschipre* 'ship' is derived from Frankish (Meyer-Lübke, 7996), *eschiper* 'to put out to sea' may well have the same origin. Unfortunately it is often difficult to determine the value of the palatal consonants in the French words.

ESPERIR, ASPERIR, v.n. 'submit to trials, undergo ill-treatment.'

v. 1322 (Judas explains that on Sunday evenings, after his week-end rest, he returns to his torments):

Diemaine al aserir
D'ici m'en voi pur *asperir*.

Variants: A *al servir*; B D. *al asseril De ci m'en vois par esperil*, D *Demeine al seir d'ici Me ravirunt mi enemi*, E *Quant vient al diemence al soir De ci m'en vois par estovoir*. L has: *set sero diei dominice ad tormenta miseranda discedo*. v. 1322 has puzzled the copyists, but MS. A (as usual) offers the most satisfactory reading. *Asseril* and *esperil* in B, though meaningless, assist materially in determining the original forms *as(s)erir* and *esperir*. The scribes of D and E have re-written two lines which were unintelligible to them.

Judas' words appear to mean: 'On Sunday at nightfall I depart from here in order to undergo torment.' The Latin translator certainly interpreted them thus. The verb *esperir*, derived from Lat. *experiri* 'to undergo, experience,' is used here in a sense hitherto unrecognized. Godefroy, under *esperir* (1), gives examples of the transitive use of the verb, with the translations 'essayer, éprouver, expérimenter,' also a single example of reflexive use (Philippe Mousket, v. 7992), in which it is rendered by 's'efforcer,' but no example of absolute or intransitive use. The context forbids us to interpret the word as *esperir* 'to perish' (from **experire*), or as *esperir* 'to awaken' (from *expergisci*). Still less can it be interpreted with Tanqueray (*L'Évolution du Verbe en Anglo-français*, pp. 426, 758, 815) as a form of *esperer* < *sperare*.

The readings of B and E suggest that *esperir* was the form used by the author; but *asperir*, used in A, with initial *as-* replacing *es-*, is also a defensible form (cf. *asorber*).

ESTURDEIER OR ESTURDIËR, v. 'make dizzy.'

v. 1718 (for the text, see *aine*).

The line is missing from MSS. B and D, while E has re-written it. The reading of A alone satisfies the requirements of sense and metre, and has every appearance of authenticity.

The verb represents *esturdir* + the verbal suffix *-ier*. For the etymology of *esturdir*, see Meyer-Lübke, 8999; and for the forms of the suffix, see *celebreier*. Godefroy does not mention the word.

GALESTE, s.f. 'missile hurled from a sling, leaden ball.'

v. 1156 (a gigantic devil hurls a blade of metal at the voyagers):

Haloet la [sc. la lamme] sus vers la nue,
E dreit vers eals puis la rue;
Esturbeiluns plus tost ne vait,
Quant sus en l'air li venez le trait,
1155 Ne li quarels d'arbaleste,
Ne de funde la galeste.

32 Rare or Unexplained Words in the 'Voyage of St Brendan'

Variants to v. 1156: D *de la funde*; B *la belleste*; E *Ne la fonde ne la galeste*. L translates vv. 1153-6: *Telum missile, aut plumbum palea* (corr. *balia*) *contortum, eam sullevatam velocitate superare non posset*.

The word occurs in this passage only, which Godefroy quotes with a note of interrogation and without translation. The leonine rhyme and the agreement of three MSS. guarantee its authenticity. It is probably, as the meaning indicates, derived from the same stem as O.Fr. *jalir* or *galir* (Mod.Fr. *jaillir*) 'lancer, jeter,' etc. (also intransitive, 'être lancé,' etc.). The verb *galir* occurs in v. 1365 of the *Brendan* (for the text, see *achalit*) with the meaning 'cast violently, hurl.' The suffix *-este* presumably represents *-ista*, of Greek origin, as in *ballista*, another military term (Meyer-Lübke, 911); cf. *arcu-ballista* > O.Fr. *arbaleste*.

The ultimate origin of *jalir*, *galir* is unknown; cf. Meyer-Lübke, 3652. The sense of 'to gush out,' which Meyer-Lübke takes as the primitive meaning, seems to be secondary; cf. Godefroy's examples. The sense of 'to hurl' is still preserved in Normandy.

GUERRE, s.f. 'confusion, medley.'

v. 1048 (Brendan's companions reproach him for singing divine service so loudly as to arouse the sea-monsters):

Beal pere chers, chante plus bas,
U si ço nun, perir nus fras;
1045 Quar tant cler' est chascun' unde
U la mer est plus parfunde,
Que nus veüm desque en terre,
E de peissuns tante guerre.
Peissuns veüm granz e crüels—
1050 Unc n'oïmes parler d'itels.

Variants to v. 1048: B *E des p.*, E *E des grans p.*; A *gurre*. L translates vv. 1047-50: *et pisces magnos et crudeles videmus innumerabiles, quales nunquam humano patebant aspectui*.

This use of *guerre*, of which no other example has come to my notice, is particularly interesting in that it preserves the original (Germanic) meaning of the word, viz. 'confusion, disorder.' The Romance peoples, obliged to give up the use of *bellum* 'war,' owing to its clash with *bellus* adj., borrowed the German word *verra* 'confusion, discord, opposition, strife,' the Germans (oddly enough) having no better word than this to designate war; cf. the *New Eng. Dict.* In v. 4 of the *Brendan*, *guerre* is used in its normal French sense of 'war,' and in v. 1730 it has the sense of 'opposition, resistance'; but in v. 1048 it conveys no sense of hostility, merely of confusion.

Wërra > *guerre* is the O.H.Germ. and O.Saxon form, corresponding to the verb *wërran* 'to entangle, embroil, bring into confusion or discord.' It is not clear why Meyer-Lübke (9554) should derive Fr. *guerre* from the Gothic form **wirro*. In early O.Fr. texts (e.g. vv. 4, 1048 and 1730 of the *Brendan*; *Chanson de Guillaume*, vv. 38, 232, etc.; *Gormont et Isembart*, v. 247) *guerre* regularly assonances or rhymes in *ę*. Cf. E. Mackel in *Französische Studien*, vi, p. 81.

HASPE, s.f. 'hasp, clasp.'

v. 688 (description of the vestments worn by the disciples of St Ailbe):

Li vestiment sunt tuit a or—
 En Arabie n'a nul si sor—
 685 Od jagunces e sardines
 Forment grandes e entrines;
 Od tupazes e od jaspes
 Itant cleres sunt les *haspes*.
 Tuit li moine sunt revestud,
 690 Od lur abét sunt fors eisud.

vv. 687–8 are missing from MS. B. Variants: D *E od t.*; A *e od les j.*, E *o bones j.*; A *clers*; D *Listees erent tutes les capes*, E *Erent listees bien les chapes*. L translates vv. 685–8: *Sardinibus quidam magnis decorantur, et topasiis et jaspidibus; clariores vero jaspides non habent.*

v. 688 had evidently been re-written in the common original of D and E; their line, though plausible, is hypermetric, and the rhyme is imperfect. MS. A, with a slight correction, alone satisfies the requirements of metre and rhyme as well as sense. The Latin translator read *jaspes* in both v. 687 and v. 688, and naturally failed to make sense of the passage. vv. 687–8 mean: 'the clasps (of the vestments) are no less bright with topazes and jaspers.'

Godefroy was unable to explain *haspe*, of which no other French example is known. The correct translation ('Spange') was given by Calmund (p. 78), but without further explanation. We have here an interesting case of the adoption of an English word in Anglo-Norman. O.Eng. *hæpse*, s.f. 'fastening, clasp' became in Mid.Eng. *haspe* (from about 1100 to the seventeenth century), and in Mod.Eng. *hasp*; cf. the *New Eng. Dict.* The Anglo-Norman form clearly represents the Mid.Eng. form, in which *ps* has undergone metathesis. The word occurs also in O.H.Germ. as *haspa* 'reelful of yarn,' and in Mid.H.Germ. as *haspe* 'hinge'; but the sense of 'clasp for fastening two parts of a garment' is found only in English, from which the Anglo-Norman form must therefore be derived.

34 *Rare or Unexplained Words in the 'Voyage of St Brendan'*

This is not the only English word adopted by the author of the *Brendan*. In v. 461 we have *raps* 'ropes' (: *draps*), a form of singular interest from both the English and the Anglo-Norman standpoint. *Bat*, *baz* 'boat' (vv. 602 and 890), on the other hand, though it corresponds in form to O.Eng. *bat*, is more likely to be of Norse origin; cf. Meyer-Lübke, 985 and Tobler.

ISSELIT, past part. as adj. 'choice, exquisite.'

v. 1688 (description of the precious stones on the wall surrounding Paradise):

1685 Mais les gemmes funt granz luurs
Dum purplantez esteit li murs:
As gutes d'or grisolites
Mult i aveit d'*isselites*;
Li murs flammet, tut abrase,
1690 De topaze, grisopase,...

Variants to vv. 1687-8: D *En l'or seent les crisolites*, E *A gotes d'or e crisolites*; *aveit*] B *out*; *d'isselites*] B *de par eslites*, DE *pieres eslites*. L has: *Crisoliti in gut[t]is aureis siti, nitorem maximum generabant*.

Of the three different readings for v. 1688, that of MS. B, though giving excellent sense and containing the correct number of syllables, ignores the median break; that of D and E contains a syllable too many, and does not connect properly with the preceding line. The reading of A is alone acceptable from all points of view, and was doubtless altered in B and in the common original of D and E owing to the strangeness of the word *isselites*.

Godefroy regarded *isselite* as a feminine substantive, explaining it as 'sorte de pierre précieuse imaginaire,' but giving no other example. There can be little doubt that it is really an adjective agreeing with *grisolites* (which is masc. or fem. in O.Fr.), and that it represents **ex-selectas*, past participle of **ex-seligere* 'to select, choose,' hitherto unknown as a Romance word. This gives exactly the sense required by the context, viz.: 'there were many choice (or exquisite) gold-centred chrysolites thereon.' The normal phonetic development would be **eisselites*, but the initial *i* is readily explained as due to the influence of double forms like *eissir* and *issir* (with *i* from stem-accented parts of the verb), *eissi* and *issi*. Similarly in Old Provençal we find *isilhar* for *eisilhar*, *isorbar* for *eisorbar*, *isemple* for *eisemple*, etc.

For the explanation of 'grisolites as gutes d'or,' see the first French version of Marbode's *Lapidary*, vv. 297-300 (Studer and Evans, *Anglo-Norman Lapidaries*, p. 39, and notes on p. 302).

LOREÛR, s.m. 'labourer, porter.'

v. 745 (the abbot of the monastery founded by St Ailbe explains to Brendan that his community is miraculously fed by God):

De Deu nus veint—el n'en savum—
 La viande que nus avum;
 745 Nus n'i avum nul *loreür*,
 Ne n'i veduns aporteür,
 Mais chescun jurn tut prest trovum,
 Sanz ço qu'ailur nus nel ruvum,
 Tute veie le jurn uvrer
 750 Entre les dous un pain enter.

Variants to v. 745: B *nul eur*, E *nul oreor*. L renders the passage: *Ex Deo escam nostram habemus, nec aliunde habere putamus; quoniam non est dapifer qui afferat aut tribuat, nec adquisitor qui perquirat aut disponat. Set unoquoque die non festo binis panem in promptu habemus....* The Latin metrical translation (ed. E. Martin in *Ztschr. f. deutsches Altertum*, xvi, pp. 289 ff.), though it abridges as usual, gives the useful line (123 c): *Panis sine bajulo, sine cura datur.*

No satisfactory explanation of v. 745 has yet been put forward. Godefroy (under *oreor*) and Calmund (p. 87) read *oreür* 'one who prays,' on the strength of *oreor* in MS. E; but this gives indifferent sense, and is contradicted by MSS. A and D. If we assume that the Anglo-Norman MS. used by the writer of E contained the forms *lorethur* : *aportethur*, his corrupt reading is easy to explain. As the Latin versions clearly indicate (*dapifer* in L, *bajulus* 'porter, carrier' in the metrical version), *loreür* designates an attendant or workman. Moreover, the author of the French poem derived the idea of this line from the *Navigatio*, where we read (ed. Wahlund, p. 38, line 13): *Panes vero quos videtis ubi pre-parantur ignotum est nobis aut quis portat ad nostrum cellarium.* Godefroy quotes two examples of *lorreour*, s.m. 'employé de cave' from documents of the early fourteenth century; there can be no hesitation in identifying this form with the *loreür* of the *Brendan*.

Loreür and *lorreour* are the French representatives of Late Lat. *laboratorem* 'manual labourer,' of which examples are given by Du Cange and Forcellini. The phonetic development of the word is interesting, in that it furnishes an additional example of vocalisation of *b* (or *v*) after *a* in French, as in *parabola* > **paraula*, *fabrica* > **faurga*, **avica* > **auca*, etc. In Old Provençal there exists the parallel form *laurador* 'labourer, peasant' (cf. Levy, *Supplement-Wörterbuch*). Godefroy's attempt to connect *lorreour* with O.Fr. *loire* 'cuve de pressoir' can therefore be disregarded.

36 Rare or Unexplained Words in the 'Voyage of St Brendan'

PURCUSDRE, v.a. 'sew over entirely.'

v. 599 (Brendan and his companions prepare for a second year's voyaging):

Quant vint li tens de lur error,
Lur nef prengnent dunc a serrer;
De quirs de buf la *purcuseint*,
600 Quar cil qu'i sunt a plein usent.

Variants to v. 599: E *quir*; B *boef*, D *bof*, E *buef*; B *la parcuseint*, E *molt bien le cuevrent*. L translates the passage: *Appropinquante mete prefixe tempore, navem suam compaginibus firmaverunt, et coriis bovinis circumsuunt, quoniam fluctuum crebra impulsio alios dissolverat.*

The form *purcuseint* is in MSS. A and D. Suchier read *purtusent* in A, but a careful study of a facsimile of this MS. leaves no doubt that *purcuseint* is the correct reading.

The passage may be rendered: 'When the time comes for them to depart, they begin to tighten (i.e. make watertight) their boat; they sew it all over with ox-hides, for those that are on it are becoming completely worn out.' Godefroy quotes the passage under *porcoudre*, which he explains inadequately as 'coudre, attacher.' The prefix *por-*, *pour-* conveys the idea of carrying a thing through to the end, of doing a thing completely, a sense which probably originated in *poursuivre* and spread thence to *purchasser*, *pourfendre*, *pourplanter* (Brendan, v. 1686), etc.; cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Hist. französische Grammatik*, II, p. 159. It was not infrequently confused in O.Fr. with the prefix *par-*, which was used in similar senses (e.g. *parfaire*, *parachever*); hence the variant of MS. B above.

RUSEIE, s.f. 'reed-bed, reeds.'

v. 1757 (description of Paradise):

1755 Li flum i sunt qui curent lait;
Cele plentét par tut en vait.
La *ruseie* siet le mel
Par le ruseit qui vient del cel.

These lines are missing from MS. B. Variants to vv. 1757-8: D *La rose est tute de miel Pur la duzur qui v. del ciel*, E *La rosee sovent de miel I chiet asses qui v. del c.* L translates: *Fluvii lactei ibi fluebant, et ros de celo subtiliter stillans mel dulcissimum erat.*

This is one of the instances in which MS. A alone offers a satisfactory reading. v. 1757 was misunderstood by the scribes of D and E, who interpreted *ruseie* (or possibly *rusee*, *rosee* in their common original) as meaning 'dew,' whereas the word signifying 'dew' is *ruseit* in v. 1758; hence they were compelled to alter v. 1758. The Latin translator evaded

the difficulty. *Ruseie* here means, not 'dew,' but 'reed-bed.' The author, having described the rivers of Paradise as flowing with milk, turns his attention to the river-banks, where (he says): 'the reeds exude honey, on account of the dew which descends from heaven.'

The word is composed of Germ. *raus* 'reed' (Meyer-Lübke, 7096) and the suffix *-ēta*. The latter, which was originally the plural form of *-ētum*, was commonly used in French to designate a collection of trees or plants, or a locality where certain trees or plants grow; similar instances in the *Brendan* are *erbeie* 'greensward' (v. 971) and *runceie* 'bramble' (v. 1745). Du Cange gives an example of the masculine form *rosetum* 'arundinetum,' which occurs in French as *rosoi* (also *roseroi*, based on *rosiere*; cf. Godefroy). The feminine form (Central French **roseie*, **rosoie*) seems to be found only in the *Brendan* (but cf. Mod.Fr. *roseaie*).

RUSEIT (for **RUSÉT?*), s.m. 'dew.'

v. 1758 (for the text, see *ruseie*).

There can be no doubt about the meaning of this word, and its masculine form is guaranteed by the metre. The alterations introduced by the scribes of MSS. D and E were due to the fact that they had already interpreted *ruseie* falsely as 'dew' in the preceding line.

In all probability *ruseit* stands for *rusét* < **rosatum*, a hitherto unnoticed masculine derivative of *ros* 'dew,' corresponding to the feminine **rosata* > *rosee*. The spelling *ei* for *e* (from free tonic *a*) is frequent in the Anglo-Norman MSS. of the *Brendan* (e.g. *esteit* < *aestatem* in v. 1751); but in this case the spelling may be due to the fact that the scribe had just written *ruseie* in v. 1757. The word might also be taken as a verbal substantive from *roseier* (cf. Godefroy *rosoier*); but in that case the *t* would need explanation.

SERIL, s.m. 'evening.'

v. 1310 (Judas explains to Brendan that he rests from torment each week-end):

Tu ne veiz rien de ma peine
Que enz en enfern jo demaine;
Cist est repos de mun peril

1310 Que al samadi prenc al *seril*.

Variants to v. 1310: A *Quel al*; E *al sabat*; B *serril*. L renders vv. 1309-10: *set requiem hic habeo laboris, que a sero sabbati inchoans, die tota dominica durat*.

There is no difficulty with regard to the meaning; Judas' rest lasts from Saturday evening to Sunday evening. But the etymology of *seril* has not been satisfactorily explained. Godefroy quotes another example (nom. *seris*) from *Li Biaus Desconeüs*. Vising (*Étude*, p. 78) explained

38 Rare or Unexplained Words in the 'Voyage of St Brendan'

it as representing the infinitive *serir* (< **serīre* for *serescere*, cf. *aserir* v. 1321) with *l* substituted for *r*, presumably by dissimilation. Birkenhoff (p. 43), followed by Boucherie (*Rev. d. langues rom.*, XXIII, p. 184), derived the word from **sericulum*, formed from *serire*, on account of the rhyme with *peril* < *periculum*. Calmund (p. 115) could offer no explanation.

The rhyme does not prove that *l* in *seril* represents *l-mouillé*; cf. *peril*: *costil*, vv. 429–30. *-il* is here an adjectival suffix, as in *gentil*, *juvenil*, etc. Just as *diurnum* (*tempus*, or *spatium*?) gave Fr. *jour*, *matutinum* (*tempus*?) gave *matin*, *serum* (*tempus*?) gave *soir*, *sera* (*hora*) gave Ital. *sera*, etc., so did **serile* (*tempus*?) give O.Fr. *seril*. The scribe of MS. B doubtless had this form in mind when he wrote *asseril* in v. 1321 (see text under *esperir*).

SOPOIS, SUPEIS, SUSPEIS, s.m. 'estimation, judgment.'

v. 997 (a slain sea-serpent is driven ashore by a gale, and serves as food for the destitute voyagers):

Dunc dist Brandans: 'Veiez, frere,
Ki enemis ainz vos ere
Or nus succurt par Deu grace;
Mangerez en grant espace.
995 Ne dutez rien, il nus ert past,
Quelque semblant qu'il nus mustrast;
Tant en pernez, as voz *suspeis*,
Que ne failet devant tres meis.'

Variants to v. 997: BD *a voz supeis*, E *a vo sopoïs*. L renders vv. 995–8: *Ex illo enim cibabitur, quamvis torvo vultu vos infestaverit, et ex illo tantum sumite, quod tribus his mensibus vobis victus non deficiat.*

vv. 997–8 may be translated: 'Take so much of it, according to your judgments (or estimation), that it may last us fully three months.' The normal meanings of O.Fr. *sou(s)pois*, viz. 'mistrust, fear, anxiety,' are inapplicable here. Godefroy quotes the *Brendan* example, and translates it 'jugement, avis, volonté,' but gives no other instance of these meanings. The translation 'volonté' is certainly incorrect here; the others might stand, but the word should be given under a separate heading, being of different formation. *Supeis* or *suspeis* in the *Brendan* is a verbal substantive from *sou(s)peser* 'to weigh or lift from beneath,' hence 'to estimate or judge the weight of.'

The word is therefore derived, not from *suspensum* (Calmund, p. 93), but from the verb *sub-* or *subtus-pensare*. As the prefix *subtus-* was constantly substituted for *sub-* in O.Fr. (cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Hist. französische Grammatik*, II, p. 156), either *supeis* or *suspeis* is an acceptable form.

SORORER, SURURER, v.a. 'overstay.'

v. 1610 (Paul the Hermit directs Brendan to return to the 'bon hoste,' who will conduct him to Paradise):

Entre en ta nef, ne demurer;
1610 Ne deit sun vent hom *sururer*.

These verses are missing from MS. B. Variants: *vent*] A *nen*; D *Ne deilunges surjurner*, E *Ne doit om sovent sororer*. L translates: *Ventus adest prosper; sine mora navem ingredere*.

The form *sururer* is guaranteed by the leonine rhyme and the agreement of MSS. A and E. To correct it to **sujurer* 'to sojourn,' with Birkenhoff (p. 81), Hammer (*Ztschr. f. roman. Phil.*, ix, p. 102) and Calmund (p. 81), is inadmissible; the rhymes prove that final *n* in *jurn*, *sujurn*, etc. was still intact in the language of the *Brendan*. The scribe of D has introduced *surjurner* (= *sujurner* < **subdiurnare*) in place of a word which was unintelligible to him. The reading *sun vent* (suggested to me by Professor P. Studer), though not in any MS., would explain the corruptions of A and E, and is justified by the mention of *Ventus* in the Latin translation.

No satisfactory explanation of v. 1610 has yet been put forward. O.Fr. *surorer* < *superaurare* 'to gild' (cf. Du Cange and Godefroy) is out of the question here. The correct interpretation is: 'Enter thy boat, tarry not; one must not overstay one's wind (i.e. one must take advantage of a favourable wind).'

Sururer is thus the equivalent of **super-horare* 'to stay beyond the hour.' It is true that neither of these forms occurs (to my knowledge) in any other text, and that no other verbal derivative from *hora* seems to be known; yet the formation is a perfectly natural one, and the existence of the word is sufficiently guaranteed by the above passage.

SORPLANTER, SURPLANTER, v.a. 'set on high.'

v. 1707 (description of the external aspect of Paradise):

Li munt sunt halt, de marbre dur,
U la mer bat mult luign del mur;
E desure le munt marbrin
La muntaine est, tute d'or fin;
1705 E puis desus estait li murs,
De paraïs qui clot les flurs.
Tels est li murs, si *surplantez*,
Qui doust estre de nus hantez.

Variants to v. 1707: B *purplantez*, D *purplatez*; E *Tos li murs est si sorplantes*. vv. 1707-8 are omitted from L.

40 *Rare or Unexplained Words in the 'Voyage of St Brendan'*

The agreement of MSS. A and E authenticates *surplantez*. Godefroy (under *sourplanter*) quotes this as the sole example, and suggests erroneously that it is synonymous with *pourplanter*. It is true that the scribes of MSS. B and D substituted (independently) the much commoner verb *purplanter* 'to plant all over,' which occurs also a few lines earlier (v. 1686); but in this case the word gives no satisfactory sense.

The meaning is clear enough. The wall enclosing Paradise is established on a mountain of gold, which is itself based on hills of marble raised high above the sea. The description is derived, not from the *Navigatio*, but from ch. XXI of the *Revelation of St John*.

SORPOIS, SURPEIS, s.m. 'overload'; fig. 'excessive trouble.'

v. 1588 (Paul the Hermit has described to Brendan how an otter brought him food during the first thirty years of his seclusion):

1585 N'ennuiout puint nostre Seignur
De tel cunreid, ne de greignur.
Puis les trent' anz ne revint cil;
Nel fist *surpeis*, ne ne m'out vil,
Mais Deus ne volt que plus de fors
1590 Venist cunreid pur sul mun cors.
Ici me fist la fontaine,
De tuz cunreiz qui est pleine.

vv. 1585-90 are not in MS. B. Variants to v. 1588: E *sorpois*; D *Ne fist surpis ne m'out vil*. L translates vv. 1587-90: *set postmodum amplius non revenit. Non quia me indignum in despectu habuerit; set Deus victum meum foris venire non voluit.*

The passage may be rendered: 'Our Lord did not find it irksome to supply me with such food (i.e. the fish brought by the otter), or with even better food. After the first thirty years it (the otter) returned no more; not that the task was too heavy for it, or that it despised me, but God did not wish that for me alone food should henceforth be brought from outside. Here he made for me this spring, which is replete with all kinds of food.'

Surpeis is a verbal substantive from O.Fr. *sorpeser* 'to weigh excessively, be too heavy,' and is used here in the figurative sense of 'excessive trouble.' v. 1588 might refer to *Deus* (cf. vv. 1585-6, which express a similar idea), but the connection with *cil* (i.e. the otter) in v. 1587 seems more natural.

Whether this is the same word as in the expression 'le sourpois des bois,' of which Godefroy (under *sourpoil*) quotes a number of examples from documents, I am unable to say. Godefroy's explanation of the word is clearly inadequate.

SUDUINE, SEDUINE, adj. 'falling down, drunken.'

v. 816 (Brendan's companions disobediently drink too deeply of an intoxicating spring):

- Tant em pristrent puis a celét
 810 Pur quei furent fol apelét,
 Quar li sumnes lur cureit sus
 Dum il dormant giseient jus;
 Qui trop beveit giseit enclins,
 Tel jurn, tel dous, tel treis entrins.
 815 Brandan priout pur ses muines,
 Que il vedeit tuz *suduines*.

Variants to vv. 815-16: E *por ses amis; vedeit*] A *ne deit*, B *vit*, D *veeit*, E *veoit*; tuz] A *tuit*, B *tut*, E *si*; B *seduines*, D *sudeines*, E *endormis*. L has: *Assidue orabat Brendanus pro monachis suis, de quorum infortunio immoderanter doluit*.

There can be little doubt that *suduines* is the correct reading; the form *seduine* used by B shows the normal dissimilation of *o..o* to *e..o*; the scribe of D tried to connect it with *sudain* < **subitanum*, but this makes no rhyme and gives no meaning. The writer of E and the Latin translator, not understanding the expression, replaced it by phrases which seemed to them to fit the context. From the *Navigatio* we learn that the monks were overcome by sleep, and that Brendan prayed to God on their behalf, but there is nothing corresponding closely to v. 816. Although no other example of the word is known, it may safely be added to the O.Fr. lexicon on the strength of the above passage; the Central French form would be **sodoine* or **sedoine*.

The word has hitherto been regarded as incomprehensible (cf. Calmund, p. 114), but the meaning required is clearly 'intoxicated, drunken' or 'prostrate,' or something very similar. The etymology, which would probably throw light on the meaning, is difficult to establish, although the choice of possible sources can be reduced within fairly narrow limits. The termination *-uine* (Central Fr. *-oine*) can represent only V.Lat. *-onium* (possibly for *-onicum*), and occurs only in words borrowed from Latin; e.g. *moine*, *chanoine*, *chalcadoine*. The prefix should be *sub-*, as in **sub-longum* > *solonc*, *sulunc*, *subducere* > *soduire*, etc. The stem should end in *d*. The word may be expected to occur in Medieval Latin; unfortunately neither Du Cange nor Forcellini gives any word satisfying all requirements. It is tempting to connect *suduine* with Lat. *succidurus* 'sinking down, failing,' the adjective corresponding to *succidere* 'to sink down.' A form **succidonius* would give the required sense, but the complete loss of the second syllable would be difficult to justify in a borrowed word.

42 Rare or Unexplained Words in the 'Voyage of St Brendan'

UMEIT, s.m. 'damp place, wet ground.'

v. 803 (the voyagers, after suffering great privations, are driven to land by a storm):

Trovent tele lur entree
800 Cum se lur fust destinee.
Un duit unt cler e pessuns denz,
Si em pernent a plus que cenx.
Mester lur unt virun l'umeit
Herbes qui sunt el betumeit.

Variants to v. 803: *virun* not in A; B *M. unt v. lu med*, D *M. l. unt a cele feiz*, E *M. lor orent voirement*. v. 804: *qui*] A *que*; A *enbetumeit*, B *el betumet*, D *esbetumeiz*, E *el betument*.

vv. 803-4 evidently puzzled the scribes, and are omitted from the Latin translation; they have hitherto baffled philologists also. Godefroy quotes them as illustrating the verb *lumer*, 'to light'! The meaning seems to be: 'They have need of herbs which are growing in the marsh around the wet ground.' The *Navigatio* (ed. Wahlund, p. 46, lines 8 ff.) says: *invenerunt fontem lucidissimum et herbas diversas et radices in circuitu fontis...*; and Brendan urges his companions: *colligite herbas et radices quas Dominus servis suis preparavit*. The Anglo-Norman text, though it seldom follows the wording of the *Navigatio* closely, has conveyed the same idea. It is natural that the monks should need fresh herbs as food after their long voyage. The poet may well have had in mind some plant such as *Cochlearia officinalis* or 'scurvy-grass,' which grows commonly in wet places by the sea and was formerly much valued for its antiscorbutic properties.

Umeit is a ἀπαξ λεγόμενον, like so many other words in this text. The stem is Lat. *um-* in (*h*)*umidus*, (*h*)*umor*, (*h*)*umecto*, etc., on which a number of O.Fr. words were formed. Godefroy quotes examples of *umé* 'damp,' *humect* 'damp,' *humidor* 'dampness,' *humoistor*, *humoidous* (these two contaminated with *muscidum* > *moiste*), etc., but the only one at all common is *humeur*. The suffix *-eit*, as in *betumeit* 'marsh' and *rocheit* 'rocks' (vv. 253, 264, etc.), represents Lat. *-ētum* indicating a locality. This suffix was added in O.Fr., not only to names of trees (as *sapinoi*, *coudroi*, *espinoi*) and of low plants (as *jonchoi*, *bruieroi*), in each case designating a place where the trees or plants grow, but also to other substantives which could be used to designate localities (i.e. *fontenoi*, *sablonoi*, and Mod.Fr. *gravois*, all quoted by Meyer-Lübke, *Hist. française Grammatik*, II, p. 43; also *fangoi*, Beroul, v. 3464). In the present passage, *umeit* appears to refer to the wet ground over which

the spring or stream actually flows, as distinct from the *betumeit* or surrounding marshy ground.

The word *betumeit* (from *bitumen* + *-etum*) also deserves notice, as it is earlier than any of the four examples given by Tobler (under *betumoi*). The form *betument* in MS. E appears to be an invention of the Picard transcriber.

E. G. R. WATERS.

OXFORD.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON LUIS DE LEÓN'S LYRICS

THE 'Notes on Luis de León's Lyrics,' contributed by Mr Aubrey Bell to the *Modern Language Review* for April 1926, make a considerable contribution towards their exegesis. Notwithstanding his work, however, and that of other Hispanists of equal distinction¹, there still remain opportunities for discussion in the text of him whom Menéndez y Pelayo called 'the greatest and least understood of our poets.' Not only the details, in fact, but even the grand contours of his poetical career are still the subject of dispute. Be that the apology for these 'Additional Notes.'

I. THE DATE OF 'CUÁN DESCANSADA VIDA.'

This is the crux of the problem of Fray Luis de León. It is not merely that accident has provided us with more manuscript information concerning it than concerning any other of his lyrics; but it also seems to have had a special fascination for its author. It is his *Hamlet*, his revelation; and on that account it has enjoyed with all classes of readers an esteem and popularity greater than can be explained on the ground of pure artistry. It is included in all anthologies and it heads many editions. Even apart from what Sr Onís' manuscript tells us about its growth, it bears the signs of considerable rehandling, at intervals extending over much of León's poetic life, both of details and of outlines. It bears witness also to the correlations of the poet's life, learning and verse. A catalogue of its sources, of course, 'explains' nothing, for the miracle of creative genius is the same whatever its tools. The tools of León are, however, his books. He takes them up and lays them down before our eyes, and his meaning is chiselled out like a statue. Not all his outlines are clear, however, and we must seek his intention in his library. In the case of this poem, there is not much dispute concerning the materials

¹ This study takes particular account of Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, *Horacio en España*, 2nd ed., I, pp. 11-24, II, pp. 26-36, Madrid, 1885; Federico de Onís, 'Sobre la transmisión de la obra literaria de Fray Luis de León,' in *Revista de Filología Española*, II (1915), pp. 215-57; Adolphe Coster, 'Notes pour une édition des poésies de Luis de León' and 'À propos d'un manuscrit des poésies de Luis de León,' in *Revue Hispanique*, XLVI (1919), pp. 193-248 and 573-82; Adolphe Coster, *Frère Luis de León; Poésies Originales*, Chartres, 1923; J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *Fray Luis de León*, Oxford, 1921; Aubrey F. G. Bell, *Fray Luis de León*, Oxford, 1925, and 'Notes on Luis de León's Lyrics,' in *Modern Lang. Rev.*, XXI (1926), pp. 168-77. My texts are generally drawn from Quevedo's edition as published in the *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, XXXVII, but the versions of *Cuán descansada vida* are from Onís, *loc. cit.*, pp. 222-5. Another text and study are promised by Adolphe Coster for the *Homenaje a Menéndez Pidal*, 1924, which I have been unable to consult.

from which it is fashioned, but the apparent strength of external evidence has tended to discourage a systematic analysis in the light of its sources and parallels. From among several texts, all equally authorised by the poet, it will be convenient to reproduce that of the Onís manuscript in its complete form, noting the variant readings offered by the more primitive version. I italicise the words and verses added by the corrector to the primitive draft.

I. ¡ Quán descansada vida
es la que huye el mundanal ruydo la del
 y sigue la escondida
 senda por donde an ido
 los pocos sabios que en el mundo a avido!

II. Que no le enturbia el pecho
 de los soberbios grandes el estado,
 ni del dorado techo
 se admira, fabricado
del sabio moro, en jaspé sustentado. por

III. No cura si la fama
 canta con voz su nombre pregonera,
 no cura si encarama ni mira
 la lengua lisonjera
 lo que condena la verdad syncera.

IV. ¿ Qué presta [a] mi contento
si soy del vano dedo señalado,
 si tras aqueste viento
 ando desalentado,
con ansias, riñas y mortal cuidado?

ILLUSTRATIONS. (G. = Garcí-Lasso, *Égloga*, II, 38-76; S. = Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, *Epístola*, VI (Salamanca, 1557), p. 87; L. 1576 = Luis de León, *Al salir de la cárcel*; L. 1577 = León, *Al apartamiento*; H. = Horace; P. = Persius.)

I, 1, 2, 5. L. 1576: Dichoso el humilde estado / del sabio que se retira / de aqueste mundo malvado.—I. G.: Cuán bienaventurado / aquel puede llamarse / que con la dulce soledad se abraza: Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, trans. H. *Epist.* I, vi, 1-2: El no maravillarse hombre de nada / me parece, Boscán, ser una cosa / que basta a darnos vida descansada (*beatum*).—5. S.: aut cum de studio fessi ad easdem semitas animi relaxandi gratia...remeamus. Cf. *Nombres de Cristo*, I, v: senda... paso algo más levantado que lo demás del suelo que le está vecino.

II and III. G.: No ve la llena plaza / ni la soberbia puerta / de los grandes señores.—II, 3. S.: Magna res est, fateor, et quæ possit regios animos sollicitare cum tectis magnificis late patentem fundum habere. León's allusion is probably to the Alhambra, not to the residence of the Bishop of Córdoba, as in Sepúlveda.

IV, 2. P. I, 28: at pulchrum est digito monstrari et dicier 'hic est.' Cf. H. *Odes*, IV, iii: quod monstror digito prætereuntium.

- V. ¡ O campo ! ¡ o monte ! ¡ o río !
 ¡ o secreto *seguro y deleytoso* !
 roto casi el nauío
 a puerto tan dichoso
 hu[yo] de aqueste mar tempestuoso.
- VI. *Vn no rompido sueño*
vn día alegre, bueno, vivir quiero ;
 no quiero ver el zeño
 vanamente seuero
del que la sangre sube o el dinero.
- VII. Despiérténme las aves
 con su *suabe canto* no aprendido ;
 no los cuidados graves
 del que anda conuatico,
del que al ageno arbitrio está rendido.
- VIII. Viuir quiero comigo,
 gozar quiero del bien que debo al cielo,
 a solas, sin testigo,
 libre de amor, de çelo,
 de odio, de speranza y de recelo.
- IX. Del monte en la ladera
 por mi mano plantado tengo vn huerto,
 que con la prima vera
 de bella flor cubierto
 en esperanza muestra el fructo çierto.

fuelle
del cielo

a vuestro almo reposo

canto suave

de aquel que sometido
el

alegre

V. L. 1577: ¡ O ya seguro puerto / de mi tan luengo error ! ¡ o deseado / para reparo cierto / del grave mal pasado ! / ¡ reposo alegre, dulce, descansado !....Sierra que vas al cielo, etc.—3. H. *Odes*, I, i: rates quassas.

VI, 1. G.: convida a dulce sueño.—3, 4. Martial, XI, ii: Triste supercilium durique severa Catonis / frons et aratoris filia Fabricia / et personati fastus et regula morum / quicquid et in tenebris non sumus, ite foras! Cf. H. *Epist.* I, xviii: deme supercilio nubem.

VII, 1, 2. G.: y las aves sin dueño / con canto no aprendido / hincen el aire de dulce armonía.—S.: matini lusciniarum et reliquarum avicularum cantus iucundi... cubitu surgentes.—3. H. *Odes*, II, xvi: nec levis somnos timor aut cupido / sordidus aufert.

VIII, 1-5. L. 1576: en el campo deleitoso / con solo Dios se compasa / a solas su vida pasa / ni envidiado ni envidioso.—1. Coster cites Herrera, III, soneto 33: Vivir con vos de hoy más. Cf. P. IV, 52: Tecum habita: noris quam sit tibi curta supellex.

IX, 1. S.: in montis latere.—2-5. Amyot, *Les amours pastorales de Daphnis et Chloé* (1559): J'ay un beau verger, que j'ay moy-mesme planté....Il y a dedans ce verger tout ce que l'on y pourroit souhaiter pour la saison: au printemps, des roses, des violettes, des lys; en esté, du pavot, des poires, des pommes.—Vergil, *Culex*, 9: dabunt cum securos mihi tempora fructus. Cf. *Nombres de Cristo*, I, i, and Bell, *Luis de León*, p. 135.

- X. Y como *cuydadoso* codiciosa
 de ver acreçentar su hermosura,
 del alto monte *ayroso*, ayrosa
 vna fontana pura
hasta llegar corriendo se apresura; para regar las flores
- XI. Y luego *sosegada*
entre los frescos árboles corriendo,
el suelo de pasada
de verdura vistiendo
y de diversa flor enriqueciendo.
- XII. El ayre el huerto orea
 y ofrezze mill olores al sentido;
los árboles menea las hojas le
 con vn manso ruido
 que del cetro y del oro pone oluido. mando
- XIII. Ténganse su tesoro
 los que de vn frágil leño se confían;
 no es mío ver el lloro
 de los que desconfían
 quando el çierzo y el ábrigo porfían.
- XIV. [*La convatida antena*]
cruje, y en çiega noche el claro día
se torna al cielo; suena
confusa bocería
y la mar enriqueçen a porfia.
- XV. A mí vna *pobrecilla*
mesa de amable paz bien abastada
me vasta: la bajilla
de fino oro librada
téngala quien la mar no teme ayrada.

X, 3-4. G.: la clara fuente.—Cf. *Nombres de Cristo*, I, i: Nace la fuente de la cuesta que tiene la casa a las espaldas, y entraba en la huerta por aquella parte, y corriendo y estropezando, parecía reírse.—S.: aquis...per opportuna præcipitia maiore strepitu gradatim desilientibus.

XII, 1-5. G.: los árboles y el viento / al sueño ayudan con su movimiento...varios olores...manso ruido.—S.: inter aquarum susurros et suavissimos odores.

XIII, 1-5. H. *Odes*, I, iii: qui fragilem truci / commisit pelago ratem / primus, nec timuit præcipitem Africum / decertantem Aquilonibus.—I, i: luctantem Icaris fluctibus Africum / mercator metuens otium et oppidi / laudat rura sui: mox reficit rates / quassas, indocilis pauperiem pati.

XIV, 1-5. H. *Odes*, III, xxix: non est meum, si mugiat Africis / malus procellis, ad miseræ preces / decurrere et votis pacisci, / ne Cypriæ Tyriæque merces / addant avaro divitiæ mari.

XV, 1-2. L. 1576: con pobre mesa y casa.—4. G.: oro luciente y puro / baja y vil le parece.—5. H. *Odes*, I, iii: nec timuit præcipitem Africum.

XVI. Y mientras miserable-
mente se están los otros abrasando
con sed insaciable
del no durable mando,
tendido yo a la sombra esté cantando;

XVII. A la sombra tendido

de yedra y lauro eterno coronado,
puesto el atento oído
al son dulce, acordado,
del laúd sabiamente meneado.

lauro y plecto

plecto dulcemente.

XVI, 5 and XVII, 1. G.: a la sombra holgando.—2. H. *Odes*, I, i: me doctarum hederæ præmia frontium / dis miscent superis.—5. H. *Odes*, II, i: mecum Dionæo sub antro / quære modos levior plectro. Cf. IV, ii: maiore poeta plectro.

Sr Onís' manuscript shows two stages in the construction of this poem, but a discussion of its sources shows a more complex evolution, at least as regards the logical order of ideas. Mr Bell has proposed as one of the models of this piece the admirable letter in which Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda describes his orchard at Pozoblanco; but, after citing the sentences in which there is the closest degree of verbal approximation, I am unable to find any satisfactory evidence that León has borrowed from that letter. There is, of course, a strong likeness between all set descriptions of gardens, and Sepúlveda's agreement with León generally runs parallel to León's agreement with Garci-Lasso. Garci-Lasso's paraphrase of the Second Epode (*Beatus ille*) is admittedly the chief source of León's inspiration, and as such appears in verses I, II, III(?), VII, X, XII, XVI-XVII, which belong to the first draft of the poem; but there are also reminiscences of this model in two of the additional verses, VI and XV. These are, no doubt, mere commonplaces, and might be explained without recurrence to Garci-Lasso. On the other hand, León's debt is entirely one of commonplaces, and the suggestions adopted in these verses are not elsewhere employed. An important difference between León and Garci-Lasso arises even at this stage. Garci-Lasso's poem is entirely third personal: there is much in León's that is objective, but his Ego appears in V, VII, VIII, IX, XIII, XVI-XVII, which are all parts of the first redaction. This Ego is connected with another phenomenon that has not been sufficiently remarked. There is more of the *décima* *Al salir de la cárcel* than of Garci-Lasso in verse I; the *décima* only, and not Garci-Lasso, corresponds to verse VIII; and the *décima* is combined with Garci-Lasso and Horace in the additional verse XV. The *décima* is first personal. The simplest reduction that

can be made of this poem is, I think, that it is an imitation of Garcilasso's lyric written under the influence of a sequence of personal emotions and aspirations similar to those of the *décima Al salir de la cárcel*, i.e., that the most primitive elements, at least in thought, are found in verses I, II, III, VII, VIII, X, XII, XVI-XVII. Let us note that in verses XVI-XVII the picture of the poet-shepherd Tityrus is from Garcilasso, and that X and XII, based on Garcilasso, contain nothing that contradicts a purely pastoral landscape. There is, however, a lacuna corresponding to verse IX, which marks the first departure from Garcilasso. León borrowed from Longus, which he could read in Amyot's translation, a description of the shepherd Philetas' garden, substituting, as is his wont, general expressions for particular, perhaps with the aid of a hint from the *Culex*. That this verse has a literary source does not make it any the less appropriate to the particular circumstances of León as may be seen by comparing verses IX-XII with the beautiful descriptions of the *granja* at La Flecha given in *Nombres de Cristo* or in Mr Bell's biography (p. 135). León, like Milton, interfuses his life and his books so that one cannot discriminate between them. Having altered Garcilasso's picture of the Contemplative Life, León adds from Horace a picture of the Active Life as a seafaring, and in his second draft he extended both similes, again with the help of Horace. I am convinced that, in writing verse XIII, León had in mind both the third and the first odes of Horace's First Book; the phrase 'de los que desconfían' corresponds to 'mercator metuens' (I, i) and not to 'nec timuit' (I, iii), which is used for the additional verse XV. Consequently the 'rates quassas' (I, i), even before verse XIV was written, would suggest the series of ideas expressed in verse V ('roto casi el nauío'), which contains precisely the sentiments, metaphors and many words of the opening verse of the ode *Al apartamiento*, written in 1577. It is an exclamation, and therefore later than the affirmations on which it is based, nor is it required for the continuity of thought between verses III and VII. The primitive conception of this ode, then, consisting of sentiments similar to those of the *décima* of 1576 and modelled on Garcilasso's ode, suffered three changes previous to its condition in the twelve-verse redaction of the Onís manuscript, viz. the simile of the Contemplative Life was retouched (IX), a contrasting simile of the Active Life was added (XIII), and from that came the exclamation in verse V. Evidence of the primitive contiguity of verses XII and XVI still remains in the twelve-verse form, where 'del cetro y mando pone olvido' (XII) corresponds to 'del no durable mando' (XVI). When

verse XIII was added, its *incipit* 'Ténganse su tesoro' (Horace's 'indocilis pauperiem pati,' 1, 1) required the emendation of the last line of verse XII into 'del cetro y del oro pone olvido.' The alterations which go to form the redaction in seventeen verses are of less importance to us at present, except that we note their emphasis on the Ego of the poet. A phrase in Persius, popular in Spain in Nebrija's edition, suggests verse IV, one from Martial verse VI; both similes are, as we have said, extended, and verse XV is a sort of summary of all that precedes it, being compounded of Garci-Lasso, the *décima* and Horace.

Up to this point I have endeavoured to avoid controvertible assertions, but it is necessary to draw from our data certain conclusions. That both the first and the second redactions of the poem show the influence of Garci-Lasso and the *décima* should discourage us from separating them by any considerable interval of time. That the first redaction of the poem should contain the essential ideas of the *décima* *Al salir de la cárcel* and of the ode *Al apartamiento* compels us to suppose either that they arose together or that the *Descansada vida* suggested them. Now the *décima* and *Al apartamiento* belong to a certain order of ideas and of studies that sufficiently account for their language. They are inspired by the profound emotion of the poet on his release from the cells of the Inquisition in 1576; they have for background a sense of the ingrained injustice of mankind, they aspire to retirement and wise contemplation, they shudder at the life of the mob as at a storm of futile passions, they express a deep thankfulness at having escaped, though hardly, from the general shipwreck of a blind world. There is something of the Second Epode in the *décima*, combined with the knot of ideas in Horace, *Epistola*, 1, xi:

Gabiis desertior atque
Fidenis vicus; tamen illic vivere vellem,
oblitusque meorum obliviscendus et illis,
Neptunum procul e terra spectare furem.

The last line makes an easy transition to the storms and shipwrecks of *Odes* 1, i, iii, v and III, xxix, but it also suggests the opening of the second book of Lucretius:

Suave mari magno turbantibus æquora ventis,
e terra magnum alterius spectare laborem,

which, after being adapted to his own case by León's canzon *Virgen, que el sol más pura*, enters naturally into the ode *Al apartamiento* in 1577. If the same metaphors, language and sequence of thoughts inspire the *Descansada vida*, it seems to me an irresistible conclusion that this lyric is the product of the same emotional experience (that of release from a

long and cruel persecution) and that it was composed in 1577. It was written after the *décima*; the first change from Garci-Lasso belongs to the spring of that year ('prima vera,' v. IX), and the third is connected with the genesis of *Al apartamiento*; the final redaction being completed still under the influence of the *décima* (v. XV). What, indeed, can 'roto casi el nauío' (which is the metaphor suppressed in 'del grave mal pasado' of *Al apartamiento*) correspond to in the experience of Luis de León if not to his imprisonment? And yet all the authorities, on the supposed testimony of the Onís manuscript, prefer to fancy this piece written in 1557—an almost miraculous anticipation of the emotions he would feel after a score of years of life and an imprisonment of five!

There is also some circumstantial evidence of a negative kind to support the date 1577. Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas, who had been León's friend since 1568, a poet of the same school and fellow-student of Horace and Garci-Lasso, in 1574 published León's translation of the Second Epode as a comment on Garci-Lasso's *Cuán buenaventurado*. He cites León in full, instead of Horace, because, as he explains elsewhere, these sentiments are still rare in Castilian poetry¹. There was, therefore, nothing to prevent his citing *Cuán descansada vida*—a much closer approximation to Garci-Lasso—*had it existed in 1574*. Secondly, it is strange that the most Horatian of Spanish poets should have drawn his inspiration in this case not from Horace but from Garci-Lasso, though he could not have failed to recognise the latter's source. Something must have directed his attention away from Horace and on to Garci-Lasso, and that is precisely the effect of Sánchez's note. The first edition of the annotated Garci-Lasso was published at Salamanca in 1574, when León was in prison; the second, issued in 1577, was probably the suggestion for *Cuán descansada vida*.

It might not have been necessary to present these opinions in argumentative form, were they not refused by all the authorities on our poet, by Menéndez y Pelayo, Onís, Coster and Bell. To Menéndez y Pelayo this poem appeared to be 'immature' and therefore anterior to 1572. He does not state his reasons for this view, but he probably does not advance it because of a certain formlessness (*desaliño*) which is due to its gradual evolution, seeing that quite late poems, like *Del mundo y su vanidad* (1578), have even less control over form. Menéndez y Pelayo's view is interpreted by Sr Onís who declares that this poem must be

¹ Sánchez, *Obras de Garci-Lasso*, Salamanca, 1577, n. 114 (cf. Gallardo, iv, 3829) and pp. 91-2: 'Trato este elegantemente Horacio, Oda 10, lib. i. Y porque vn docto destos reynos la traduxo biẽ, y ay pocos casos destos en nuestra lengua, le pondre aqui todo: y ansi entiẽdo hazer en el discurso destas sentencias quando se ofreciere.'

anterior to 1572 because of its objectivity, and by Mr Bell who considers it both objective and subjective. The objectivity of this poem is partly due to its model which is entirely third personal, so that every introduction of an Ego (quite frequent, as we have seen, even in the first draft) is the personal contribution of Luis de León; it is also partly due, I think, to the circumstance that this is the first subjective ode on a topic not either religious or erotic in Castilian literature, and so would have been tentative in its manner at whatever date it were composed. It is rather M. Coster than Sr Onís who draws conclusions from the title of the manuscript which refers to the retirement of Charles V in 1557. For M. Coster the first twelve verses were written at that date, and the remainder are probably not by Luis de León. Mr Bell is yet more comprehensive: he thinks that the earliest sketch may have arisen at any time after the issue of Boscán and Garci-Lasso's poems in 1543, that the first draft of twelve verses was inspired by the emperor's retirement in 1557, together with some hints from Sepúlveda's letter, while nothing shows when the poem was completed. All these writers agree in believing that Luis de León's typical poem can have been written on the basis of another's experience. M. Coster also states the argument of 'immaturity,' but in a conveniently concrete manner. He thinks the anacolutha in both drafts of verse VII are immature: they may be merely careless or signs of preoccupied thought. Similar immaturity is, it seems, shown by the unskilful division of the adverb 'miserable/mente' between two lines. No great skill is required to write 'y miserablemente / mientras...' for 'y mientras miserable/mente...'; but the odd thing is that in none of his many subsequent revisions did León repent him of that divided adverb! A similar 'unskilfulness' was shown by Sappho when she wrote *ισδάνει καὶ πλάσιον ἄδῃ φωνεύσας ὑπακούει*, and for the same reason. The *lira* contains two phrases only, the first of two lines and the second of three; the connection of lines within each phrase may be as rapid and need not be more formal than that of a sapphic and its adonic. Others have considered that divided adverb a merit in León.

More serious than the charge of immaturity is the evidence of the manuscript of the Royal Library at Madrid, No. 2-B-8, II, *Papeles varios*, núm. 21, discovered by Sr Menéndez Pidal and described by Sr Onís in the *Revista de Filología Española* for 1915. No. 21 appears to be an autograph of Luis de León, although, as his handwriting loses character when done carefully, Sr Onís does not care to risk a categorical assertion. In this handwriting we have *Cuán descansada vida* in twelve verses as already indicated. These verses have interlinear corrections and the

additional five are written in the margin in a handwriting necessarily much smaller and rather cramped. Sr Onís does not care to affirm the identity of handwriting, which M. Coster denies. So far as one may infer from a facsimile, the formation of the letters (notably *d, g, h, f, s, v*) is the same, and indicates the same writer or same writing-master. It is at least certain that those who wrote the text and marginal additions did not write the heading that this sheet bears: 'Despreçio del mundo. Al recogim^o. de Carlos quinto'; nor were these words written by Prudencio de Sandoval (1553-1620), many of whose notes and papers enter into this miscellany. The writer's information appears to be copied from the index, but with a difference in the syntax: 'No. 21. Despreçio del Mundo. Composiciones poéticas al recogimiento y retiro *al* Emperador Carlos V.' The coherence of a collection of miscellaneous papers depends as often as not on the authority of the indexer or the binder, but we have no indication concerning either in connection with 2-B-8. If Sandoval had anything to do with this collection, there is still nothing to show that it was formed within fifty years of the event cited. Consequently, though we attribute a high importance to the text of the Onís manuscript as containing a probable autograph of León both in the copy of verses and in the corrections and marginalia, the information proffered by the heading and index appears to be anonymous, undated, syntactically ambiguous, and to be received with distrust.

M. Coster has, however, discovered in this poem specific references to the Emperor. He compares 'vivir quiero conmigo' with Herrera's 'vivir con vos' in a sonnet addressed to the Emperor with reference to his retirement, but apart from the fact that León is more likely to have noticed Persius' famous 'tecum habita' than Herrera's sonnet, this comparison strangely confuses *meum* and *tuum*. 'Del cetro y del mando pone olvido' and 'del no durable mando' are certainly phrases worthy of a monarch, but they are no more than a periphrasis for ambition, which was probably León's most insidious temptation. To cite a Horatian parallel when discussing a Horatian poet, we do not date 'Persicos odi, puer, apparatus' by Xerxes or the younger Cyrus. Charles' last voyage was stormy and many of his servants were sick, but 'roto casi el naufo' belongs to the nexus of metaphors in *Al apartamiento* and is as old as the Horatian 'rates quassas.' If the Emperor was interested in gardening in his retreat at Yuste, so was the aged Philetas in Longus, Horace on his Sabine farm, Sepúlveda at Pozoblanco, and León himself at La Flecha. The scent of the orange-blossoms at Yuste may be sweeter than any at Salamanca, but León's 'mil olores' is but a transcription of

Garci-Lasso's 'varios olores.' On the other hand, the concluding verse depicts beyond a doubt the pastoral or reflective poet, a Tityrus beneath the beechen shade who intends to give his mind to poetry and music. However far the Emperor may have been from living a life of mortification and contrition in his monastery, Luis de León—a subject and a churchman—would not have dared to make any suggestion other than that of Herrera's sonnet:

vivir con vos d'oi mas, i dar al cielo
parte de vuestras obras i grandeza.

(*Versos*, III, son. 33.)

No verse conjugated in Ego could be fittingly addressed to the great Emperor by an undergraduate, but there are seven of these in the first draft alone. No verse that particularises a person of middle social station could be used of the Emperor; but that is the function, as M. Coster himself has noted, of some of the additional verses. 'Les strophes ajoutées plus tard (he writes in *Poésies Originales*, p. 7), que je ne traduirai pas, ont transformé cette poésie en un éloge de la vie champêtre, et la description de Yuste en celle de *La Flecha*, maison de retraite des Augustins près de Salamanque. Rien ne prouve qu'elles soient de Luis de León.' Nothing proves this—apart from fourteen out of fifteen manuscripts cited by Sr Onís, the margin of the fifteenth and all the editions.

In short, it seems to me, that no single argument offered in favour of the date 1557 and the connection with the Emperor's retirement is sound, but that the date 1577 has been established. The proof may be long, but the principle is concise. In a difficult case I have sought to demonstrate that Luis de León's greatest poem is the product of his deepest emotion. We shall now have the more confidence in looking for the same emotional veracity in his other lyrics.

II. THE AFTERTHOUGHTS OF LUIS DE LEÓN.

A comparison between the variant readings in Merino's edition and those offered by Sr Onís for *Cuán descansada vida* forbids us describing the former, despite Menéndez y Pelayo's emphatic assertion, as unique and definitive, although Merino may have come as near to a critical text as León's manner of writing permits. For while many or even most of the varying versions of his poems carry signs of his authorship, it is not certain that he ever corrected them so as to form a finally authorised text. The manuscripts examined by Merino give some indications concerning the growth of León's poems structurally as well as verbally, and this evidence can be extended by inferences drawn from his use of

sources. Our poet's imitations of classical authors are always directly based on their texts, and there is no vague similarity of thought such as could be attributed to mere reminiscence. We must, therefore, suppose that some time, long or short, elapses between the use of one classical source and another. In a few cases it is possible to point to breaks in the continuity of a poem through the insertion of additional matter, and it is generally true that a poem can dispense with particular verses. Luis de León, apart from the canzon *Del conocimiento de sí mismo*, has no strophic sense; his poems are sequences of verses in mere juxtaposition, which sometimes rise to a climax of emotion, but may be extended or reduced at the pleasure of the writer. When we can point to a piece that still retains or appears to retain its first garb, such as that despairing cry *Huid contentos de mi pecho vanos*, we find León writing in a nervous and sinewy style, economical of metaphors, eschewing elaborate or ornamental description, and with a decided leaning towards abstract expression. The extreme conciseness of his metaphors and similes in such a case contrasts with their leisurely elaboration in his greatest odes, which bear witness to the advantage he drew from his classical studies, especially from Vergil, Horace, Lucretius and Macrobius. All his greatest similes can be detached from their context, and in some cases they are not unanimously supported by the manuscripts; in almost all cases it is possible to indicate for them a classical original. This has already been noted in the *Descansada vida*, in which there is textual evidence that the similes adapted from Horace are posterior to the first conception of the poem.

León uses two similes in *La cana y alta cumbre*. In comparing the sudden revolt of the Moriscos in 1568 to a summer storm he had plenty of Vergilian models, such as *Georgics*, I, 322-24, and *Aeneid*, I, 88-91 and VIII, 525-29, most probably one of the latter; the lines that compare Alfonso de Portocarrero at the skirmish of Poqueira to a lion pursuing goats is borrowed from *Aeneid*, x, 723-28, in which Vergil uses the same language concerning Mezentius. Both of these can be detached from their context, though there is nothing to show whether they are or are not original elements of the poem, which certainly gains in beauty by their insertion. To the great ode *A Salinas* ('El aire se serena') has been added a single verse, which is wanting in Quevedo's edition, and whose rejection by Irusta is praised by M. Coster. The poem as a whole is based on Macrobius' exposition of the theory of the music of the spheres (*Commentarius ex Cicerone in Somnium Scipionis*, II, ii). In paraphrasing these speculations, León continues his account from the cause of the

music, which is the revolution of the Primum Mobile, to its nature as a harmony of notes proportionately separated ('música, que es de todas la primera....Y como está compuesta / de números concordes...'). This continuity is certainly broken by the fine verse:

Ve cómo el gran maestro
a aquesta inmensa cítara aplicado,
con movimiento diestro
produce el son sagrado,
con que este eterno templo es sustentado.

Coleridge has expressed the same thought with more pantheism and less Christianity in his *Aeolian Harp*:

And what if all of animated nature
Be but organic Harps divinely framed,
That tremble into thought as o'er them sweeps,
Plastic and vast, one intellectual breeze,
At once the soul of each and God of all?

The suggestion is made by Macrobius, *op. cit.*, II, iii: 'nam et Apollinem ideo Μουσᾶγέρην vocant, quasi ducem et principem orbium cæterorum, ut ipse Cicero refert: *Dux, et princeps, et moderator luminum reliquorum, mens mundi et temperatio*. Musas esse mundi cantum etiam sciunt, qui eas Camenas, quasi canenas a canendo dixerunt.' Macrobius also has a chapter (I, xiv) on 'Cur mundus hic universus Dei vocetur templum.' As this writer's commentary on the *Somnium Scipionis* is the source of León's Platonism and of his astronomical science, it is hazardous indeed to reject a verse which is magnificent poetry and deeply marked by his mental habits. That the simile of the swimmer or wrecked sailor in *Virgen, que el sol más pura*, borrowed from the opening lines of Lucretius' Second Book, was composed apart from the Petrarchan poem in which it occurs, we know from P. Méndez's evidence (cited by M. Coster) that it was found written on one of the leaves of the poet's Bible. The simile of a summer storm, transcribed from *Georgics*, I, 320 ff., is used with great effect in *Cuando será que pueda*. León contrived to free himself from the pagan suggestion of

Ipse Pater, media nimborum in nocte, corusca
fulmina molitur dextra,

by referring to his own translation of *Psalm* civ, verses 2 and 4¹, which was printed in, and perhaps written for, *Nombres de Cristo*, I, viii:

Alaba ¡o alma! a Dios, Señor, tu alteza
¿qué lengua hay que la cuente?
Vestido estás de gloria y de belleza
y luz resplandeciente.
Encima de los cielos desplegados
al agua diste asiento.

¹ Not *Psalm* xviii, v. 10, cited by M. Coster. The 'carro' distinctly pertains to *Psalm* civ.

Las nubes son tus carros, tus alados
caballos son el viento.
Son fuego abrasador tus mensajeros,
y trueno y torbellino.

That this simile of the summer storm is posterior to the rest of the poem is shown by two circumstances: it interrupts the continuity of phrasing between verses 7 and 11 ('...y el trueno dónde viene....Y de allí levantado...'), and it introduces an idea foreign to the original conception. According to the Platonic theory the place of the Ideas and of God is the Empyrean Heaven, and the souls of the just aspire to gaze on them from the Primum Mobile: 'hinc profecti huc revertuntur.' The region of clouds and thunder is, on the other hand, beneath the moon and quite terrestrial; to look for God in the storm is a cardinal notion of Semitic poetry. It is doubtless passages like this which have suggested to critics a certain Hebrew strain in León's genius: it is worth noting, however, that the simile is mainly Vergilian, and that the Psalms are employed only to Christianise a manifestly pagan phrase. Two verses in the ode *A Santiago* (12 and 13), borrowed from Catullus, XLIV, 14-18, are an unhappy employment of pagan material in the midst of Christian mythology, and are a rarity in Luis de León, who is singularly successful in reconciling his classical studies with his religion. There is an inopportune subtlety, too, in the second verse of *No siempre es poderosa* which cannot be understood without referring to Horace, *Odes*, III, iv. To cite Enceladus as a testimony to the general truism that vice is not ever triumphant may be an afterthought, though there is nothing conclusive to prove this.

There are, no doubt, some additional verses that do not belong to the poet. Such is, in M. Coster's opinion, the one which has been added by Merino to *Las sirenas a Cherinto* (between verses 10 and 11). He is also less sympathetic than the late Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly, Churton and Merino, to the four that form an appendix to the ode *A la Ascensión*. Without venturing a categorical affirmation on this point, one can at least say that the additional verses are essentially another poem, a poem on a poem. The loose attachment of additional verses is also a phenomenon of León's style. This has happened in his imitation of Horace, *Odes*, II, ix (one of the Nise poems) and is most easily distinguished in *Qué vale cuanto vee* and *Del mundo y su vanidad*. In the former the nucleus consists of verses 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and is appropriately concluded by a thought from Horace, *Odes*, III, iii:

si fractus inlabatur orbis
impavidum ferient ruinae
(y si el alta montaña
encima le viniere, no le daña).

In this form the lyric is a dissertation on the vanity of riches, and is linked in matter and manner to *A la avaricia*. So when Merino imports an additional verse (No. 4), M. Coster has cause for rejecting it. But

Quien de dos claros ojos
y de un cabello de oro se enamora
compra con mil enojos
una menguada hora,
un gozo breve que sin fin se llora,

if erotic, and therefore not characteristic of León's style, is not without parallel in his work. Thus, Sr Menéndez Pidal¹ offers us

Poniendo él en vos sus ojos,
hizo los vuestros tan claros, &c.

That a verse in León is inopportune or interrupts the sense is not a sufficient reason for rejecting it as apocryphal. It is more important to note, however, that the simile of fortitude, with which the poem originally concluded, suggested to our poet the addition of two verses (7 and 8) which paraphrase Horace's simile of the just man and the tough mountain oak (*Odes*, iv, iv, 56-60). A primitive version of this simile in one verse appears in his *Exposición de Job*, viii, 20. It is not certain when the ninth verse of this poem was written. As it is taken from *Odes*, iii, iii ('Iustum et tenacem'), it may have been the original conclusion of this poem. At all events, León paraphrased 'non vultus instantis tyranni / mente quatit solida' as

libre de espanto
ante el tirano airado,
de hierro, de crueza y fuego armado.

The word 'fuego' suggested to him another passage he had read, viz. Prudentius, *Peristephanon*, v, 165-73 (familiar to him both as a Spanish poet and as one on whom Nebrija had lectured), and so he continues: 'el fuego, dice, enciende...' (verses 10-13). Even more rambling is the composition of *Del mundo y su vanidad*. The first eighteen verses are occupied with miscellaneous original reflections, then five paraphrase the opening lines of Horace's first satire, two tell the apologue of the Horse (originally Ass) and the Ox which is ultimately a Sanskrit tale; the twelve succeeding verses are a calendar of princely disasters which occurred between January and October in the year 1578, and in four more the poet scrambles to a Christian conclusion. M. Coster wishes to reject this piece, which has the support of four manuscripts and Quevedo's edition, but Mr Bell is much happier when he champions it on account of its incidental beauties.

¹ Menéndez Pidal, *Estudios literarios*, Madrid, s.a., p. 169.

One other important afterthought in Luis de León's poetry is his use of the *Song of Songs*. The seventh verse of *A Santiago* is of this type, though M. Coster rejects it as apocryphal. A more important use of the *Song of Songs* is found in *Alma región luciente* and *Noche serena*. The second, third and fourth verses of the former are León's paraphrase of the twenty-third Psalm (Vulg. Ps. xxii), which is not found among his translations. This version might have been written in preparation for the chapter entitled *Pastor* in *Nombres de Cristo*, I, vi. In that chapter, León continues from the biblical description of the Good Shepherd to speak of the 'esposa pastora' (from *Song of Songs*, i, 6) and of the Shepherd as depicted in pastoral poetry, thus:

Bien y con razón le conjura a este pastor la esposa pastora que le demuestre aqueste lugar de su pasto.—Demuéstrame, dice, oh querido de mi alma, adónde apacientas y adónde reposas en el mediodía.—Que es con razón mediodía aquel lugar que pregunta, adonde está la luz no contaminada en su colmo y adonde, en sumo silencio de todo lo bullicioso, sólo se oye la voz dulce de Cristo, que cercado de su glorioso rebaño, suena en sus oídos dél sin ruido y con incomparable deleite, en que traspasadas las almas santas, y como enajenadas de sí, sólo viven en su Pastor.

Hence verses 5-8:

Y de su esfera cuando
la cumbre toca altísimo subido
el sol, él sesteando
de su hato ceñido
con dulce son deleita el santo oído.

Toca el rabel sonoro,
y el inmortal dulzor al alma pasa,
con que envilece el oro,
y ardiendo se traspasa,
y lanza en aquel bien libre de tasa.

¡Oh son! ¡oh voz! ¡siquiera
pequeña parte alguna descendiese
en mi sentido, y fuera
de sí el alma pusiese
y toda en ti ¡oh amor! la convirtiese!

Conocería dónde
sesteas, dulce Esposo, y desatada
de esta prisión adonde
padece, a tu manada
vivirá junta, sin vagar errada.

The first verse of *Alma región luciente* depicts the same supernal pastoral landscape as is offered by the chapter we have cited from *Nombres de Cristo*:

Vive en los campos Cristo, y goza del cielo libre y ama la soledad y el sosiego, y en el silencio de todo aquello que pone en alboroto la vida, tiene puesto él su deleite. Porque, así como lo que se comprende en el campo es lo más puro de lo visible, y es lo sencillo, y como el original de todo lo que de ello se compone y se mezcla, así aquella región de vida adonde vive aqueste nuestro glorioso bien es la pura verdad y la sencillez de la luz de Dios y el original expreso de todo lo que tiene ser, y las

raíces firmes de donde nacen y adonde estriban todas las criaturas. Y si lo habemos de decir así, aquellos son los elementos puros y los campos de flor eterna vestidos y los mineros de las aguas vivas, y los montes verdaderamente preñados de mil bienes altísimos, y los sombríos y repuestos valles, y los bosques de la frescura, adonde exentos de toda injuria, gloriosamente florecen la haya y el oliva y el lináloe, con todos los demás árboles del incienso, en que reposan ejércitos de aves en gloria y en música dulcísima que jamás ensordece. Con la cual región si comparamos *aquesto* nuestro miserable destierro, es comparar el desasosiego con la paz, y el desconcierto y la turbación y el bullicio y disgusto de la más inquieta ciudad con la misma pureza y quietud y dulzura. Que aquí se afana y allí se descansa. Aquí se imagina y allí se ve. Aquí las sombras de las cosas nos atemorizan y asombran, allí la verdad sosiega y deleita. Esto es tinieblas, bullicio, alboroto; aquello es luz purísima y sosiego eterno.

This paragraph is not without hints of the Platonic moral astronomy of the *Noche serena*, but it contains almost literally the prose version of the last four verses of that poem, beginning with 'Quién es el que esto mira...', the phrasing being most similar in the last verse:

¡Oh campos verdaderos!
 ¡oh prados con verdad frescos y amenos!
 ¡riquísimos mineros!
 ¡Oh deleitosos senos!
 ¡repuestos valles de mil bienes llenos!

In short, evidence can be offered either from the manuscripts or by textual criticism that many of León's poems were of gradual growth, though it would be more difficult to give the dates of the accretions. Mere logical consistency is not sufficient to determine whether a verse be genuine or false, and in generalising his emotions in the classical manner it is possible that he sometimes included ideas that were not characteristically his own. He was accustomed, in particular, to quarry his metaphors and descriptive passages out of the classical poets, vastly enriching his work by so doing. But it is also clear that another powerful inspiration was the poetry of the Bible, and particularly of the *Song of Songs*, and in these cases we have to take note of the correspondences between his prose and his verses.

(To be continued)

W. J. ENTWISTLE.

GLASGOW.

HERDER'S INFLUENCE ON THE METRICAL VERSION OF HÖLDERLIN'S 'HYPERION'

THE following pages are part of a longer essay on those fragments of *Hyperion*, which, being written in blank verse, are usually called 'Die metrische Bearbeitung.' They are to be found under this title in Zinkernagel's edition of Hölderlin's *Sämtliche Werke und Briefe*, Band II (1914), pp. 245-60. It is not certain that Zinkernagel's arrangement of these fragments is correct, but that does not affect my argument. In the part of my essay not here printed I have sought to prove that the rigorism of 'die Weisen' (*op. cit.*, p. 245, line 1 ff.) is not properly attributable to Kant, as has been generally assumed, but rather to the doctrines of earlier ascetic philosophers, especially the Stoics, the Neoplatonists, St Augustine and the Christian theologians who followed him.

In what follows I attempt to show that 'der weise Mann' (*op. cit.*, p. 247) speaks a language very closely resembling certain utterances of Herder, to whose views Hölderlin appears to me to be making such direct reference in this fragment that one need scarcely look to Schiller, still less to Fichte, for an intermediary between Hölderlin and Plato.

The (one) wise man, whom Hyperion visited on his travels, is clearly opposed to the (many) wise men, whose doctrines had taught him to despise the senses and form a low opinion of Nature. It does not, however, follow that he is to be identified with any one individual wise man known to Hölderlin. The very fact that his doctrines embody not only the myth of Eros from Plato, but also a commentary on this myth goes to prove this. Still more does the fact that arguments have been put forward for both Schiller (recently by Claverie) and Fichte (earlier by Zinkernagel) as Hölderlin's 'model.' More probably he is a composite picture drawn from Plato, Rousseau, Schiller, Kant, Heinse, Bouterwek and—as I shall now try to show—above all Herder, with whom one must necessarily here couple Hemsterhuis. To the latter I shall devote the minimum of attention, remarking only (1) that it was he who, not only in the *Lettre de Dioclès à Diotime sur l'Athéisme* (of 1787), but also in *Alexis* and elsewhere drew into prominence the views of this 'sage et sacrée' instructress of Socrates; (2) that he insisted (in *Alexis*) that the third and final Age of Gold would only arrive when man 'verra distinctement les bornes de son intelligence dans les faces de l'univers qu'il peut connoître,' and (3) that, while laying stress on the higher

faculties possessed by 'l'être pensant,' he insists upon the necessity and validity of the senses which are the medium of 'cette acquisition des idées primitives, commune à l'homme et à la brute¹.'

More important still for us is Hemsterhuis' *Lettre sur les Désirs* (of 1770)², since it called forth a dissertation by Herder, the value of which, for our fragments, would seem to have been overlooked. Herder called his essay *Liebe und Selbstheit* and wrote it as a commentary on Hemsterhuis' *Lettre sur les Désirs*. This was not Herder's earliest attack upon rationalism and I select it chiefly because it comes closest to Hölderlin's fragment. But before turning to it, let me cite two or three paragraphs from Herder's essay *Vom Erkennen und Empfinden, den zwei Hauptkräften der Menschlichen Seele* (1775)³, in which he emphasises the truth that 'Erkennen' exists 'nie ohne Empfindung' and deals faithfully with the failure of Descartes and his successors to explain the relationship of the two:

Darf ich einige Proben von den Mängeln der vorhergenannten Einseitigkeit geben? Seit Des-Kartes das Denken zu seinem ganzen zweifelnden Ich machte, welche Systeme sind aufkommen, Eins unnatürlicher als das Andre. Er hing die Seele in der Zirkeldrüse auf, und liess sie denken; wie nun aber den Körper bewegen? Sie kanns nicht. . . Gott musste kommen und ihn bewegen: die Denkerin auf ihrem ruhigen Teppich winkt ihrer Sklavin nur Gelegenheit zu. Also Des-Kartes. Spinoza, ein durchdringenderer Geist, der Theologe des Kartesianismus brachte beides dahin, wohin Des-Kartes Eins brachte: warum sollte der Gedanke nicht so gut unmittelbare Wirkung und Eigenschaft Gottes sein, als die Bewegung? Alle Individuen erloschen also dem denkenden wie dem bewegenden Gotte. Beide sind Eigenschaften Eines Wesens, die Spinoza weiter untereinander zu bringen vergass oder verzweifelte, da er sie so weit von sich geschoben hatte. Er war ins Empyreum der Unendlichkeit so hoch hinaufgeschwindelt, dass alle Einzelheiten ihm tief unterm Auge erbliehen: dies ist sein Atheismus und wahrlich kein anderer. Leibniz kam, fürchtete den Abgrund, stand aber an Des-Kartes Ufer. Es blieb, die Seele könne den Körper nicht bewegen, Gott, in jedem Moment auch nicht: wie aber, wenn der Körper sich selbst bewegte? wenn sein Urheber dafür von Anbeginn gesorgt hätte, obs gleich kein Mensch angeben könnte, wie? Nur dass er der Denkerin immer gerade komme—und so ward das schöne System der prästabilierten Harmonie daraus, mit seinem herrlichen Gleichniss der zwei Uhren: das witzigste System und das passendste Gleichniss, das je erdacht ward.—

¹ *Lettre sur l'homme et ses rapports, Œuvres philosophiques de F. Hemsterhuis*, nouvelle éd., Paris, 1809, I, p. 138. It is worth noting that Hemsterhuis has a good deal to say on this point of the likeness and unlikeness of man and beast. At p. 139 he cites from Cicero, *De Officiis*, the following sentence: 'Inter hominem et beluam hoc maxime interest, quod haec tantum, quantum sensu movetur, ad id solum, quod adest, quodque praesens est, se accommodat, paululum admodum sentiens praeteritum aut futurum.' This is further proof, if any were necessary, that this contrast (Mensch—Tier) belongs to the *koinē* of thought in this age and also that Cicero's authority was still worth invoking.

² *Œuvres*, ed. cit., I, pp. 61–90, where it is immediately followed by the essay by Herder (pp. 91–130) in French, and with the title: 'De l'Amour et de l'Égoïsme, par M. J. J. Herder.'

³ *Sämmtliche Werke*, ed. Suphan, VIII (1892), pp. 263 f. The paragraphs cited are from p. 266. Cf. also *ibid.*, pp. 169 f. and especially pp. 176 (on Liebe), 179 (on Achilles), 181 (influence of body on soul) and 185 f. (on Sinne). Finally (p. 233) Herder says roundly: 'Alles sogenannte reine Denken in die Gottheit hinein ist Trug und Spiel, die ärgste Schwärzerei. . . .' Cp. p. 67, line 9, below.

Welche todte, hölzerne Uhr ist nun Seele und Seelenlehre geworden. In allen gegenseitigen Wahrnehmungen des Denkens und Empfindens entgeht ihr innige Ableitung, Fruchtbarkeit und Wahrheit.

In ihrem vielartigen, tausendfach organisirten Körper fühlt sich die Seele mit allen ihren Kräften *lebend*: selbst ihre Kraft zu erkennen und zu wollen sind nur Resultate, Aggregate dieser Verbindung: durch Aktion und Reaktion auf diesen Körper voll Empfindungen, voll Reize, ist sie nur im Universum *gegenwärtig*: selbst das Bewusstseyn von sich entgeht ihr sonst...

‘Selbst das Bewusstseyn von sich entgeht ihr sonst.’ How much more than this did Hölderlin need for his argument¹? Nothing surely that is not to be found in Plato on the one hand and in Herder’s later essay on *Liebe und Selbstheit* on the other.

This essay follows Herder’s version of the letter of Hemsterhuis, *Sur les Désirs*, to which the translator attached a ‘preliminary reminder’ of the ‘wealth of ideas, beauty and rarity’ of this letter, in the course of which he writes:

Vielleicht hat seit Plato über die Natur des Verlangens in der menschlichen Seele niemand so reich und fein gedacht als unser Autor. Sein System ist gross wie die Welt, ewig wie Gott und unsre Seele.

But his remarks were written down hastily and contain certain obscurities of expression, due to ‘die Französisch-Metaphysische Sprache, die unsrer Philosophie fremd ist².’ These Herder proceeds to clear up in his essay.

It begins with the ‘schöne Sage der ältesten Dichtung, dass Liebe die Welt aus dem Chaos gezogen’ and points out that the idea common to all versions of this story is ‘dass Liebe die Wesen vereinige, wie Hass sie scheide,’ but it was soon discovered ‘dass diese Liebe *Grenzen* habe, und eine völlige Vereinigung der Wesen in unserm Weltall selten oder gar nicht stattfinde.’ This, too, was seen to be a wise ordinance of the Creator, who thus provided for the ‘vesten Bestand einzelner Wesen.’ The two forces, love and hate, were the counterparts of those in Nature—‘*Anziehung und Zurückstossung*’—

und ich glaube [Herder adds], es war schon *Empedokles*, der Hass und Liebe zu Zeichnerinnen des Umrisses aller Geschöpfe machte³: durch Hass, sagte er, werden die Dinge getrennt, und jedes *Einzelne* bleibt was es ist; durch Liebe werden sie

¹ Even the ‘Tier-Mensch-himmlisches Wesen’ triad is here. Cf. *l.c.*, p. 268: ‘Siehe eine Aufgabe, wie die menschliche Seele gross und weit und tief... sie wagte, den grossen Zwist ins Auge zu nehmen, nach dem der Mensch ausser und in sich Thier und Engel, Pflanze und Gott ist.

Der Engel im Menschen wie lässt er sich zum Thier herunter? die menschliche Pflanze, wie blühet in ihr Gott?’

² Cf. Herder’s *Sämliche Werke*, xv, p. 56, and for what follows, *ibid.*, pp. 304 f.

³ Cp. Empedocles Agrig., ed. Sturz, Leipzig, 1805, p. 516, ll. 74-76, and pp. 566 f. Herder cites the Greek thus:

Εν δε κοτω διαμορφα και ανδιχα παντα πελονται
 Συν δ’ εβη εν φιλοτητι και αλληλοισι ποθειται
 Εκ των γαρ παντ’ οσα’ ην, οσα τε εστι και εσται.

verbunden und gesellen sich zu einander, [but he adds, at once] sofern sie sich nehmlich ihrer Natur nach, gesellen können; denn freilich auch über die Liebe, sagten die Griechen, herrscht das *Schicksal*; und *Nothwendigkeit*, die älteste der Gottheiten, ist mächtiger, als die Liebe. Nach Platons Ideen ward diese von der *Dürftigkeit* und dem *Überfluss* in den Gärten Jupiters geboren: sie hat also die Natur beider, und ist immer abhängig von ihren Eltern.

The doctrine of Empedocles on love and hate, modified by the doctrine of Ananke, and the two brought together by the use of the Platonic myth of the birth of Eros, we have them here in a single paragraph of Herder's and anyone who turns from this to Hölderlin's lines¹ beginning:

'Das volle Maas,' begann er nun, 'woran
Des Menschen edler Geist die Dinge misst
Ist gränzenlos und soll es seyn und bleiben...'

and proceeding via the struggle with 'der ehernen Nothwendigkeit,' to the concept of 'die Melodien des Schicksaals':

Verstandst du sie? Dasselbe
Bedeuteten seine Dissonanzen auch,

thus leading up to the marriage of Poros and Penia, must surely say to himself, 'Herder here quite certainly offered Hölderlin every element he needed for this metrical fragment.'

But, lest anyone still doubt, let us follow Herder further. He deals at once with the question of 'consciousness,' for to Herder there is no consciousness without feeling, and says:

Die Gottheit hat es weise und gut gemacht, dass wir unser² Daseyn nicht in uns, sondern nur durch *Reaction* gleichsam in einem Gegenstande ausser uns fühlen sollen, nach dem wir also streben, für den wir leben, in dem wir doppelt und vielfach sind.

Nature offers so many 'anziehende Gegenstände' of such varying force that our heart and life 'gleichsam eine Harmonika des Verlangens, das Kunstgebilde einer immer *reinern, unersättlichen, ewigen*³ Sehnsucht würde.'

A little later Herder asks⁴:

Wie kann, was Körper ist, mit dem reinen Geist Eins werden? zwo Dinge, die eigentlich nichts mit einander gemein haben, und nur durch eine Art freiwilliger Trunkenheit, wie die Griechen dichteten, ursprünglich *vermischt* werden konnten.

¹ *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Zinkernagel, II, p. 249.

² v.l. 'Unser eigen Daseyn.' Cp. Hölderlin's lines (*ibid.*, p. 253):

'Der leidensfreie reine Geist befasst
Sich mit dem Stoffe nicht, ist aber auch
Sich keines Dings und seiner nicht bewusst,
Für ihn ist keine Welt, denn ausser ihm
Ist nichts—'

'Leidensfrei' equals 'gefühlshfrei' here.

³ Italicised words are spaced in Suphan's text.

⁴ *Sämtliche Werke*, xv, p. 309.

From this he proceeds to the praise of friendship as a higher, purer state than love, but only to admit that Nature saw

dass diese reine himmlische Flamme für uns auf Erden meistens zu fein wäre [and therefore gave it] irdische, sinnliche Reize, und nun erschien Venus Urania als—Aphrodite. Liebe soll uns zur Freundschaft laden, Liebe soll selbst die innigste Freundschaft werden¹.

Discussing the various forms of love Herder comes to the question of our enjoyment of God: 'aber wie wird der ewige genossen? durch Anschauung? oder durch Empfindung?' He sees the analogy between St Theresa's heavenly love and the more common earthly love which may also be the cause of 'Ohnmacht' in the lover: 'denn in den Säften des Körpers ist Liebe und Liebe an Wirkungen gleich, wer auch der Gegenstand seyn möge.' The human heart must beware; 'selbst im Strom der göttlichen Liebe bleibts immer nur ein menschliches Herz....'

Our *isolated individual being*, Herder adds, necessitates 'die Grenzen, die unserer Liebe und Sehnsucht hienieden bei jedem Genuss gesetzt sind.' For, he points out in the following paragraph (*op. cit.*, p. 321) and here comes quite close to Hölderlin's language:

Wir sind *einzelne Wesen*, und müssen es seyn, wenn wir nicht den *Grund* alles Genusses, unser eigenes *Bewusstseyn*, über dem Genuss aufgeben, und *uns selbst* verlieren wollen, um uns in einem andern Wesen, das doch nie wir selbst sind und werden können, wieder zu finden. Selbst wenn ich mich, wie es der Mysticismus will, in Gott verlöre, und ich verlöre mich in ihm, ohne weiteres Gefühl und Bewusstseyn *meiner*: so genösse *Ich* nicht mehr; die Gottheit hätte mich verschlungen, und genösse statt meiner. Wie gut hat es also die Vorsehung gemacht, dass sie das Saitenspiel unsrer Empfindungen nur nach und nach, in sehr verschiedenen Klängen und Arten wecket, dass sie unsre Sehnsucht jetzt auffodert, jetzt einschränkt, unser Verlangen hier thätig, dort leidend übet, überall aber, auch nach dem süssesten Genuss, uns auf unser armes Ich zurückwirft, sagend gleichsam: 'Du bist doch ein eingeschränktes, einzelnes Geschöpf! Du dürstest nach Vollkommenheit, aber du hast sie nicht! Verschmache nicht am Brunnen dieses einzelnen Genusses, sondern raff dich auf und strebe weiter.' Lasset uns dieses in einigen auffallenden Proben und Beispielen sehen.

The next paragraph interests us chiefly for its picture of the human being as tyrannically inclined.

Der Mensch ist ein Tyrann des Weltalls; aber wie bald ist auch dieser kleine Tyrann, wenn er in den Grenzen der Natur bleiben will, vom Raube gesättigt!

Hölderlin's phrase 'das alles Begehrende, alles Unterjochende' rises here

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 313. I find it necessary to remark that I had written this essay up to this point before receiving the *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift* for July, 1926 (iv, Heft 3) which contains a very important essay by W. Böhm on 'Hölderlin als Verfasser des "Ältesten Systemprogramms des deutschen Idealismus,"' in which a general reference is made to the strong influence on Hölderlin of both Hemsterhuis and Herder in their anti-rationalistic writings, including Herder's *Über Liebe und Selbtheit*. Böhm looks on the 'Jüngling' as a 'Kantian' rigorist *pur sang*, to whom are addressed the 'Mahnungen' of the wise man, a view which seems to me barely tenable.

inevitably to our memory, and we almost seem to be reading *his* words when Herder continues:

Ein Tyrann, der alles allein seyn, der alles verschlingen will, wie Saturn seine Kinder, ist weder zur Freundschaft, noch zur Liebe, selbst nicht einmal zur Vaterzärtlichkeit fähig. Er drückt und unterdrückt: neben ihm kann nichts wachsen, geschweige, dass es mit ihm zusammen wachse zu Einer gemeinschaftlichen Krone.

'Auch das wird hieraus offenbar,' Herder returns to this point to insist (*ibid.*, p. 323)

dass die Anziehungskraft einer einzelnen menschlichen Seele sich ins *Unendliche* weder ausbreiten könne, noch ausbreiten dürfe. Die Natur hat schmale Grenzen um jedes Einzelne gezogen; und es ist der gefährlichste Traum, sich unumschränkt zu denken, wenn man eingeschränkt ist, sich Despot des Weltalls zu glauben, wenn man von nichts als einzelnen Allmosen lebet....

After another digression Herder comes back once more to illustrate his thesis with a striking metaphor:

Unmöglich kann er (sc. der Einzelmensch) also wie Meeresschleim mit *allem* zusammenfließen, unmöglich alles *in gleichem Grade* lieben, loben und gutheissen... Er schadet damit dem Guten so sehr als dem Bösen, und verliert zuletzt ganz sein Urtheil und seinen Standpunkt. Wer nicht zurückstossen kann, kann auch nicht anziehen; Beide Kräfte sind nur *Ein Pulsschlag* der Seele.

The reference to the theory of Empedocles could not be clearer. And in the final paragraph Herder insists again (like Hölderlin) on the law of our being, the necessity of a 'Gegenstand' for our feelings, thoughts and activities:

Um zu geben, müssen immer Gegenstände seyn, die da nehmen; um zu thun, andre, für die man thue... Und was endlich den Genuss des höchsten Wesens anbetrifft; o da bleibts immer 'Hyperbel mit ihrer Asymptote,' wie unser Autor (sc. Hemsterhuis¹) sagt, und muss es bleiben. Die Hyperbel nähert sich der Asymptote, aber sie erreicht sie nie: zu *unsrer* Seligkeit können wir nie den Begriff unsers Daseyns verlieren, und den unendlichen Begriff, dass wir *Gott* sind, erlangen. Wir bleiben immer Geschöpfe, wenn wir auch die Schöpfer grosser Welten würden. Wir nahen uns der Vollkommenheit, unendlich vollkommen aber werden wir nie. Das höchste Gut, was Gott allen Geschöpfen geben konnte, war und bleibt eignes Daseyn, in welchem eben Er ihnen ist und von Stufe zu Stufe mehr seyn wird *Alles in Allem*.

These passages from Herder's *Liebe und Selbstheit*, bearing definitely on Hemsterhuis' essay on Desire (*Verlangen*) have been cited fully because they seem to contain all that Hölderlin needed by way of encouragement to grasp the Platonic myth of Eros in his own fruitful way. The fuller, more argumentative account of the inevitable connection in us of feeling and thought which Herder offers in his essays *Vom Erkennen und Empfinden der menschlichen Seele* may be compared with the essay on 'Selbstliebe' and would, of course, strengthen in Hölderlin the view there put forward. It is unnecessary to do more than quote two para-

¹ Cf. Hemsterhuis, *Œuvres*, I, p. 90. Herder refers to S. 108, presumably of the first edition, and Suphan adds [T. Merk, Nov. 1781, S. 121, 122].

graphs from the revised version of 1778 (*Sämtl. Werke*, VIII, p. 233): they are the first two general remarks with which the essay closes:

1. Ist etwas in ihr (sc. dieser Abhandlung) wahr: wie fein ist die *Ehe*, die Gott zwischen *Empfinden* und *Denken* in unsrer Natur gemacht hat! Ein feines Gewebe, nur durch Wortformeln von einander zu trennen. Das oberste Geschöpf scheint mit uns Ein Loos zu haben, *empfinden* zu müssen, wenn es das Ganze nicht aus sich ruft und denket. Und welches Geschöpf kann das? Keins als unsre Philosophen, die Lehrer und Lehrlinge am hohen Baume der Weisheit.

2. Alles sogenannte *reine Denken* in die Gottheit hinein, ist Trug und Spiel, die ärgste Schwärmerei, die sich nur selbst nicht dafür erkennt. Alle unser Denken ist aus und durch Empfindungen entstanden, trägt auch, Trotz aller Destillation, davon noch reiche Spuren. Die sogenannten reinen Begriffe sind meistens reine Ziffern und Zeros von der mathematischen Tafel, und haben, platt und plump auf Naturdinge unsrer so zusammengesetzten Menschheit angewandt, auch Ziffernwerth. Dem Manne, der in der ganzen neuern Metaphysik diese Geisterchen aufsucht und abthut, dess warten mehr als des Gespensterhelden *Thomasius* Ehrenkränze; nur muss er sich auch nicht für manchem leeren Schrecken, und für Griffen dieser Geisterchen in sein Gesicht, fürchten.

To this we will add only a sentence or two from the version of 1774 (*ibid.*, VIII, p. 255), in which the idea of our limitation is still more clearly brought out:

Den edelsten, endlichen Geist können wir uns nicht ohne Sinnlichkeit gedenken; seine Sinnlichkeit ist aber auch voll Geistes: er umfasst ein Universum, das er sich aufs klärste und thätigste auflöset.

Das Hauptgesetz also des Einflusses und der Abhängigkeit beider Kräfte liegt in der Natur des eingeschränkten, endlichen Wesens. Durch Empfinden lernts nehmlich erkennen: Sinne und Gefühl sind ihm der reichste, leichteste und angenehmste Ausdruck des Guten und Wahren. Es steht an einem noch unentzieferten Weltall und lernts entziefen, die allgemeinen Eigenschaften desselben, die Göttlicher Natur sind, in seine Natur auflösen.—

My argument for Herder's influence on the genesis of the metrical fragments of *Hyperion* is, I hope, full enough to convince those who can still look at this question with an open mind. Naturally I am not the first to see that Hölderlin and Herder were closely related in mind and temper. Adolf von Grolman spoke of Herder in 1919 as 'diesem Hölderlin in vielem so nah verwandten Geist' and drew attention (in *Fr. Hölderlin's 'Hyperion'*, Karlsruhe, 1919, p. 8, n. 3) to Klaiber's reference to 'die seelische Ähnlichkeit Hölderlins und Herders.' The Swiss writer, Herr K. E. Hoffmann, in a review of Betzendörfer and Haering's *Neuaufgefundene Jugendarbeiten Hölderlins* (*Sonntagsblatt der Basler Nachrichten*, May 14, 1922, No. 20), which he has been so kind as to send me, drew special attention to Herder's influence on the young Hölderlin in the following words:

Zweifellos war Hölderlin schon im Stift mit *Herders* ästhetisch-kritischen Jugendschriften, besonders aber mit dem Werke Herders 'über den Geist der ebräischen Poesie,' wahrscheinlich eben durch den Stiftsephorus Schnurrer bekannt geworden; denn *Herdersche* Gedanken sind für diese schülerhafte Jugendarbeit Hölderlins bestimmend geworden.

Betzendörfer in his very useful little work on *Hölderlins Studienjahre im Tübinger Stift* (Heilbronn, 1922) brings together the names of Hemsterhuis and Herder: pointing out Hölderlin's special interest in the former, he remarks: 'Mit besonderer Vorliebe studierte er (Hölderlin) die Schriften des holländischen Philosophen Hemsterhuis, den Herder so sehr schätzte.' He reminds us that it is not improbable that Hölderlin followed Hemsterhuis' example in choosing the name of Diotima (instead of Melite) for his heroine in the final form of *Hyperion*. As is well known, Hemsterhuis gave this name to his correspondent, the Princess Amalie von Gallitzin. But the idea may have been original. Through Conz, Bardili or some other mentor he had already become acquainted with parts of Plato's works¹ and it was to Plato's solution of the problems of knowledge and of the beautiful that he was being led as early as 1790. By 1792 he was acquainted with the *Republic*, for, as Betzendörfer's researches in the college library at Tübingen have shown, the only two volumes Hölderlin ever borrowed from the library were volumes VI and VII of the Zweibrücken edition (1781-7) of Plato, with the notes of Marsilius Ficinus, and these contain the *Politicus*, the *Minos* and the *Republic*. If, as we may assume, Hölderlin at this time read the *Republic* he would thereby become familiar with the Platonic assumption of the three elements of the human psyche, reason, will and feeling. We also see clearly from the *Parallel between Solomon and Hesiod* of 1790, as Betzendörfer has pointed out², that Hölderlin's aesthetic ideas are at this period those of Mendelssohn rather than of Kant. We may, in fact, assert that the Platonic and Neoplatonic emphasis upon the feeling of the soul for beauty is fundamental and personal in Hölderlin³. For Hölderlin the poet in man precedes the thinker, not merely historically, but psychologically, as inevitably as for Herder the child (aus dem Orient) and the 'Jüngling' (der Grieche) precede the man of ripe judgment (der Römer) and of grey-haired age and wisdom (mediaeval and modern man).

Fräulein Erdmann in her praiseworthy zeal to establish Hölderlin's independence of feeling and thought turns his relation to Herder almost upside down when she remarks (p. 34): 'In Herders "Ältester Urkunde des Menschengeschlechts" findet sich der Werdensgedanke sehr Hölder-

¹ Cf. Betzendörfer, *Hölderlins Studienjahre*, pp. 30 and 128 (note 87) and my remarks in part I of my book. See also Betzendörfer, *op. cit.*, p. 46: 'Das Schöne ist nach Hölderlin (in the *Parallele* of 1790) Gegenstand des Empfindungs- und Begehrungsvermögens.'

² *Jugendarbeiten*, p. 18.

³ Cf. *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Zinkernagel, II, 108-9 and the very pertinent remarks of Veronika Erdmann, *Hölderlins ästhet. Theorie*, Jena, 1923, pp. 9 ff.

linisch "in dem ewigen Wechsel von Licht und Nacht," von Schlummer und Tätigkeit gesehen: dass aus der Nacht alles komme, steht auch in Hölderlins "Brod und Wein." It would be pertinent to remark that this idea is as old as man: the day itself is born of the night and in the Hebrew myth of the creation, recorded so poetically in the beginning of the book of *Genesis*, we have it already in perfect form. It is useless and misleading to treat Hölderlin as though he were devoid of personality and originality, but equally vain to think of him as one who had neither education nor teachers. He was, as Zinkernagel rightly observed some twenty years ago, 'ganz besonders ein Kind seiner Zeit,' so much so, in fact, that he stood already deeply rooted in the religion, philosophy and psychology of his age before he began *Hyperion* or approached the *Critiques* of Kant. With such a training as he had in Denkendorf, Maulbronn and Tübingen it could not be otherwise. It should never be forgotten that the study of theology was the real aim of this education, but this included the history of philosophy, portions of the patristic works, Latin and Greek philosophy (especially the pre-Socratic) and at least an introduction to modern ideas of philosophy and psychology¹.

We may feel sure that by 1792 Hölderlin's mind was thoroughly well prepared to accept the lead of Hemsterhuis² and Herder and to find in the Platonic myth of Eros a solution of the riddle of consciousness and also, in part at least, a thesis for his novel. The metrical fragments show us how this solution was reached. Their spirit and, in part, even their letter seem very largely due to Herder.

MARSHALL MONTGOMERY.

OXFORD.

¹ Cf. Part I, ch. v of my book, Betzendörfer, *Studienjahre*, ch. II, esp. pp. 39-44 and Erdmann, *op. cit.*, p. 47, where due stress is laid on the pre-Socratic influence.

² Jansen's *Collection des Œuvres philosophiques de M. F. Hemsterhuis*, the second edition of which I have cited above, was first published in 1792.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

FURTHER NOTES ON 'BEOWULF'

ƿæt hē for eazlum Ʒeƿōd
DeniƷa frēan (Wyatt and Chambers' edition, ll. 358-9).

For eazlum is an interesting example of a prepositional phrase equivalent to the simple *for, fore*, 'before.' Lines 2853-4 supply the parallel: *sæt frēan eazlum nēah*, where the reference is to Wiglaf, seated near his lord. Heyne-Schücking (1913) translates the latter, 'sass den Achseln des Herrn nahe,' and explains the former as 'nicht gerade vor ihm, sondern etwas zur Seite, wie es die Etikette erforderte.' But the Italian parallel:

Ora sen va per un secreto calle,
 tra il muro della terra e li martiri,
 lo mio maestro, ed io *dopo le spalle* (*Inferno*, x, 1-3)

seems to justify the simpler renderings 'before,' 'near.' Anglo-Saxon has a variety of such phrases, *on menzu*, *on zemanz*, *be sīdan*, *for þingum*, *for intinzan*, etc., and they are common, among other languages, in Modern Welsh, e.g. *ynghŷydd*, 'in the presence of,' *yn ôl*, 'in the track of.'

ac hē ƷiƷe-wæpnum *forsworen hæfde* (l. 804).

Despite Ten Brink's opinion that there is no evidence to support the rendering 'put enchantment on,' most recent scholars explain *forsworen* in some such way, e.g. 'laid a spell on' (Chambers), 'made useless by a spell' (Klaeber). The use of spells in Anglo-Saxon times is confirmed by *Salomon and Saturn* (162): 'Golden is the word of God, he may bring to flight the hating spirit, the fighting fiend, if thou at first over him bringest Prologa prima, whose name is P.'

Other hints of heathen practices are found in the denunciations against witches and *wīzleras* (*Laws of Edward and Guthrum*), in Aelfric's censure of *þā hæðenan sanƷas þæra lēwedra manna ond heora hlūdan cheahchetunƷa*, and elsewhere.

In view of these survivals, it is possible that Panzer (*Studien zur germanischen Sagengeschichte*) is right in detecting a connection between *butan his līce swice* (l. 966) and the disappearing trick in the old folktales of his A-type. Mr D. H. Crawford has recently suggested that there may be a hint of 'some mysterious hypnotic power possessed by Grendel' in the phrase *swefeð ond sendeð* (l. 600).

scuccum

(l. 939).

Holthausen (*Beowulf*, 2nd ed.) suggested that the Modern English equivalent of *scucca* ('demon, devil') is 'shock,' but abandoned this for 'shuck,' 'gespenstischer Hund,' in his *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. According to an article in *Word-Lore* (vol. I, No. 3), Shuck is still the name of a Norfolk demon, to meet which, in the shape of a black dog, means certain injury or death. His Yarmouth equivalent is, apparently, Scarfe.

*Hwæþere hē his folme forlēt
tō lif-wraþe lāst weardian,
earn ond eazle*

(ll. 970-2).

'The vague and elastic character of words' in Anglo-Saxon poetry (Klaeber's *Beowulf*, p. lxvii) is well illustrated by *lāst* and its compounds. The most obvious meaning is 'track, trace, footprint,' cf. *on lāst faran* (l. 2945), but, in the above passage, the hand, the arm, and the shoulder themselves constitute the *lāst*. It is possible to regard *lāst weardian*, together with *swaðe weardade* (l. 2098), as equivalent to 'remain behind,' though the nouns may have here the special force of 'evidence, proof of former presence or existence.' When the hand is inspected by the aethelings (ll. 983 and 2098) it is already fixed to the gable-end of the building. In l. 841 *lāstas* clearly refers back to the hand, arm, and shoulder of ll. 834-5, and is kept distinct from the *troðu*, 'footprint,' of l. 843. The compound *feorh-lāstas* (l. 846) has also a specialised sense, 'traces of disappearing life.'

druncne dryht-zuman

(l. 1231).

The formula-like character of this phrase and the attributive use of *druncne* find a parallel in Goethe's *Hermann und Dorothea*: 'Getrunken noch einmal!'

Curiously enough, the same poem supplies a comment upon one of the Anglo-Saxon riddles (No. 30). When the Moon forsakes the sky at dawn, the Sun prepares to start on her westward course. At this moment, according to the riddle, *dūst stonc tō heofonum, dēaw fēol on eorðan*. Tupper has suggested (*Riddles of the Exeter Book*, p. 139) that the reference may be to the dust 'raised by the cool wind that, in early Germanic poetry, blows at the dusk of day; see Grimm's *Teutonic Mythology*, 745, 1518.' This is confirmed by the *Hermann und Dorothea* parallel:

*als nun des Morgens
Mich die Kühlung erweckte, die vor der Sonne herabfällt.*

Consequently, the reference in the riddle is to morning, and not, as has sometimes been supposed, to evening conditions.

zefēn3 pā be feaze

(l. 1537).

This text is adopted by Holthausen, Heyne-Schücking, and others on metrical grounds, in accordance with the view of Rieger and Morgan (*Beitr.*, xxxiii, p. 117) that the finite verb alone does not normally take the alliteration in an A-type of this class. Whether the argument is sufficiently strong remains, however, doubtful in view of l. 758. But it is scarcely an argument against the emendation *feaze* (MS. *eaxle*) that 'hair-pulling is a hag's weapon' (Wyatt), since the Anglo-Saxon laws of Aethelbert imposed special penalties for this, suggesting that it was, more or less, common. The use of the term *sceard*, in connection with injuries to the nose, etc., justifies its retention in the compound *heaðo-scearde* (l. 2829).

for andrýsnym

(l. 1798).

But slight stress has been laid upon the existence of a code of courtesy in Anglo-Saxon times, anticipatory of the familiar fifteenth-century codes. In ll. 1794-8 a special attendant is assigned to Beowulf to supply such needs as warriors (*heoþo-līðende*) like himself were likely to have on such a day (*þý dōȝore*). Courtesy, likewise, suggested Wulfgar's ceremonial attitude in ll. 358-9 and the leaving of the warriors' arms outside the hall (ll. 397-8). 'Courteously' is, again, the probable force of *ēstlice* in *Andreas*, l. 292.

bearn wið blōde

(l. 1880.)

Bearn (MS. *beorn*) has been explained as either the past of *byrnan* (Holthausen, Heyne-Schücking, Chambers) or of *be-iernan* (Heinzel). The correctness of the former view is proved both by the alliteration and by the parallels: *hizesor3a burnon on brēostum* (*Genesis*, l. 774), *hreðer innan wēoll, beorn brēostsefa* (*Christ*, ll. 539-40). A similar physiological conception occurs in the Middle English *Richard Cœur de Lyon*: *Ffor wraþ hit brent negh his blode*. In view of the *Christ* passage, it seems, however, unnecessary to emend MS. *beorn* to *bearn* (cf. *Christ*, ed. Cook, p. 128); *beorn* is supported by *biorn* (l. 2559) and is a Late West Saxon spelling for *born*, due to nasal influence from *bran*, followed by metathesis. The spelling *beorn* arose under the influence of *w*-forms, in which *weo*- rounded to *wo*-. The confusion of spellings is well illustrated in *weordum ond worcum* (l. 1833), where *weordum* is, likewise, analogical. Schlemilch (*Beiträge zur Sprache und Orthographie spätaengl. Sprachdenkmäler*) supplies the parallels, *weolde, zeweorhte, feorþsīþ*, etc. Another LWS. spelling, not always recognised, may occur in *hize-mæðum* (l. 2909), since *æ* for *ē* became common before dentals and in labial neighbourhood, cf. *fætl, dæð, hwæne* (Schlemilch, p. 21).

ofer sǣ side

(l. 2394).

A staple argument against the identification of the *Gēatas* with the ON. *Gautar*, Swed. *Götar*, is the fact that, in this passage, they are said to have attacked the Swedes across 'the wide sea.' But, despite the Heyne-Schücking emendation *ofer sǣ-side*, the reference is, in all probability, to one of the great lakes, e.g. lake Vänern. It is noteworthy that Heb. *yam*, Arabic *bahr*, and Greek *thalassa* all have the meaning 'river, lake,' in addition to the more general 'sea' (cf. *The Century Bible*, Psalm 106, 7). There is also the closer parallel of German *See*, which means 'sea' in the feminine, but 'lake' in the masculine.

*heals ealne ymbefēnȝ
biteran bānum*

(ll. 2691-2).

Biteran bānum may be rendered either 'with sharp teeth' or 'with sharp claws.' The couplet:

That I fadmede, al at ones,
Denemark, with mine longe bones

(Havelok, 1295-6)

tends, however, to support the latter.

P. G. THOMAS.

LONDON.

TWO NEWLY FOUND MIDDLE ENGLISH TEXTS

By the kindness of Miss Pearson, of the Registry of the University of Wales, who found the documents for sale in Cardiff, and of the Committee of the Free Library, Whitechurch, Shropshire, to whom they now belong, I am allowed to publish a Middle English letter and a quatrain.

I.

The letter apparently alludes to Sir Gilbert Talbot (b. c. 1383; d. at Rouen, 19 October 1419) as still alive. He became Lord Strange of Blakemere (near Whitechurch) in 1413, and a Knight of the Garter in 1407 or 1408. He was the elder brother of John Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury. The 'All Eddysley' of the letter is probably Edgeley, 1½ miles S.E. of Whitechurch. Bowcock in his *Place-Names of Shropshire* (1923) records the form 'Edisley' in 1286. He does not mention the prefix 'All,' but with this, 'All Stretton' may perhaps be compared. The English of the document has some possibly West Midland features, e.g. the pronominal form *hure* < OE. *heora*; *Hullemore* (?); *hond*, *lond*. The letter is written in an ordinary early fifteenth-century hand, with the usual contractions, which I have here expanded in italics; *p* and *ȝ* are

used. There are a few interesting words noticed below. I thank my colleague, Dr William Rees, for helping me to read the documents.

Ryght worshipfull mayster, plesse it ȝow to here þat er Leecroft whos fader was geten of a paramour to William þe sone and þe heyr of Roger Meverell fre tenaunt of all Eddysley, wenyng to HIM¹ recouered Eddysley, persewyng² no þyng þat tyme aȝeynes Jon Hullemore my fader and Margaret Shermon þat stoden ryghtfull heires to Jon Parrok and Alice atte crosse of all Eddysley sayyng þe pryde part of þe dower of Jon Parrokys part to Isabell³ his wyf to þe terme of hir lif? þat þe seyde Jon Hullemore anon after þe deth of Owyn ap David went to Eddysley by record of neghbores and took ceson pere and broght a turfe in his hond in þe name of ceson & bar it to my lord sire gilbart to Blakemere, bisechyng him of his hye lordship þat he wold helpe him is ryght of Eddysley, & my lord took þe turfe of him and seyde he wolde help him with a good wyll and þis promise my lord performed after whan þer was made instance to him þerfore at Southhampton goyng in to Fraunce ward from whennes he sent his letter and his seel for to holden us in our ryght, charyng our adversaries for to cese hure persut aȝeynes us. But Leecroft þe bastardys sone not withstondyng þis forbedyng of my lord persewyd after writtys of entre³ at Westmynster makyng no mencoun þat tyme in his persut aȝeynes þe seyde Jon Hullemore what þat ever þey haue addyd or ymppyd⁴ in sethe⁵ hyderward: but entryd up on Jon Woday and Mevanewyth, þat þanne uniuistly occupieden Eddysley and receyvyd þe comoditees þerof as long as þay myght, til þe sayde Leecroft [and þey]⁶ fellen to accord; & after þat he also uniuistly presume to occupye, & þusse þey helden out my fader þe trewe heir þerof, for all my lordys mayntenaunce, in his absence, [and for all his possessioun takyng in þe soyl to strengthen us in our ryght,]⁷ in to þe tyme þat my seyde fader come in to þe plenar court afore ȝow þat my lord hath set pere in his stede to do ryght and equite to all his tenauntys & axyd leve of ȝow & hadde it for to be tryed pere by twelve men, who shulde have ryght to Eddysley, & þey charyng conscience axedyn respit in to þe nexte court day, & þanne by good delibera[ti]on þey comen & ȝeven up hure verdict, saying by hure othes þat þe seyde Jon Hullemore & Margarete Shermon were trewe heirs to þat lond. Now seth it is so þat ȝe be þe meste⁸ worpy & mest suffisaunt styward þat ever we cnewyn here & ȝour dede in my lordys court is his dede: we take ȝour actes don pere as for hegh auctorite to us in so much þat as fer as we dare we clayme my lord & ȝow to be as partye with us as well for þat oure adversaries setten no prys by my lord sire Gilbertes forboddyng⁹, as for to mayntene ȝoure courtes here, þat oure adversaries wol not be governyd by, but persewen to hyer courtes, holdyng hem no þyng content of ȝoure lawys here, but persewyn at Westmynster where men cnowen no more who shulde have ryght [here]¹⁰ þanne I do now what men doth in rome. But we make a protestaçon and we may recovere here in þis court þagh it lay in oure power to persewe elleswhere for our ryght. We holden my lordys court so suffisaunt for us þat we nyll never seche other iustificaçon¹¹ but pere as þe lond lyth. AND we hope þat my lord wol noghwher elles have it termyned but here.

¹ *h* and four minims; we should read *han* = 'have' (infin.)? There may have been confusion in the writer's mind, between this construction and that of *wenen* with *to* and a personal pronoun, occasional, e.g. in Berners' *Froissart*.

² *persewyng*, etc. throughout, may be *pursewyng*, etc.

³ *writtys of entre*: see *N.E.D.*, s.v. *Entry* 2 (1499 on).

⁴ *ymppyd in*: 'added', 'thrust in': in *N.E.D.*, s.v. *Imp* vb. 5, the first example of this transferred use is 1592, though the construction with *in* occurs earlier.

⁵ *sethe*: or *seth*? = 'since.'

⁶ [and *þey*], added above the line.

⁷ [and...ryght], added above the line.

⁸ *meste*: or *most*?

¹⁰ [here], added above the line.

⁹ *forboddyng*: or *forbeddyng*?

¹¹ *iustificaçon*: = either 'vindication' or some other sense like the usual modern meaning, for which the *N.E.D.* quotes instances from 1494 on: or, less probably, 'administration of justice' (*N.E.D.*, 1381-8 on).

AND ryght excellent sovereyn, zif any man axe what evidence we have, we answeren a3eyn þerto [a3eyn]¹ & seyn þat god & good cuntrey, þurgh socore of my lord, & 3ow & all his good counsayll is oure evidence, for it is so notory² & so y noysed³ in all þis lordship, þat þe seyde Jon Hullemore and Margarete beth þe nexte lawfull heires to þat lond þat ben now on lyve, þat we may not go þerfro but zif we have to much wrong. Wherefore I hope þat god & good cuntrey, whych han wrought for us fair hiderto, þurgh helpe of my lord & 3ow and his good counsayll wol make a good ende of þat þey han well bygonne.

Vox populi vox dei⁴
Si deus nobiscum quis contra nos⁵.

II.

On the back of a late fourteenth-century Latin grant of lands by Robert de Ward, lord of Kingsley, to Robert Fitzrobert of Lascawe of Thornbury in the vill of Thornbury, temp. Edward III.

Merci Marie maydene clene
þu let me neuer on sunne⁶ duele
pray for me þat it be sene
& get me fro þe pine of ele.

CYRIL BRETT.

CARDIFF.

ITALIAN SOURCES OF LYRICS OF THOMAS LODGE

I. LODGE'S SUPPOSED DEBT TO DOLCE.

The indebtedness of Thomas Lodge to Italian poets was copiously illustrated in an article contributed to the *Modern Language Review* some years ago by Professor Kastner⁷, who pointed out Lodge's debt not only to the writers he himself mentions (Martelli and Paschale) but to other Italian writers (Petrarch, Ariosto, Sannazzaro and Bembo) as well. In *A Margarite of America* (1596) Lodge informs the reader that certain poems included in his romance are written 'in imitation of *Dolce* the Italian.' His statement has been generally accepted and his supposed debt to Dolce frequently mentioned. Professor Kastner wrote, however, of being unable to find these poems in any accessible edition of Dolce's works. Further investigation brings to light the fact that four of the

¹ [a3eyn], erased in MS.

² notory: see *N.E.D.*, s.v., where the first instance is of 1399, and its use is chiefly legal.

³ y noysed: no hyphen.

⁴ I do not know where this phrase first occurs. It is used by Alcuin, *Epp.* 166 (Migne, p. 191 A); by William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontif.* i, 14 (R.S. ed., p. 22): both these authors mention it as a well-known saying: and by Hoccleve, *De Regim. Princip.* 2886 marg. (E.E.T.S. ed.). It seems to have been put to political use more than once in English History.

⁵ *Rom.* viii, 31.

⁶ Or *sinne*? I think it is *sunne*.

⁷ Vol. II, pp. 155-61.

five poems Lodge ascribes to Dolce were translations not from Dolce but from Paschale, an obscure Italian poet of the first half of the sixteenth century, from whose *Rime Volgari*¹ Lodge had borrowed (with acknowledgment) the sonnet 'Those glorious lamps that heauen illuminate' also included in *A Margarite of America* (p. 78).

The first mention of Dolce in Lodge's romance occurs in connection with a group of four poems which Lodge claims were written 'in imitation of Dolce the Italian.' The first of these, a sonnet, 'If so those flames I vent when as I sigh' (p. 13)², is a translation of a sonnet of Paschale's 'Se'l foco di sospir noiosi & greui' (Sig. C viii a). For the second poem of this group, a sonnet, 'O desarts be you peopled by my plaints' (p. 14), I have found no source, but the third, a sestina, 'With Ganimede now ioines the shining sunne' (pp. 14-16), is a translation of Paschale's sestina 'S'aggira hormai con Ganimede il sole' (Sig. C vi a-C vi b). The fourth poem, another sonnet, 'O curious Gem how I enuie each while' (p. 16), is a translation of Paschale's 'Quanta ti porto inuidia ó bel Monile' (Sig. E vi a).

Later in this same novel Lodge states that another poem, 'I see with my hearts bleeding' (p. 76), is 'written in imitation of Dolce the Italian, beginning thus: "Io veggio, &c."' This poem too was translated not from Dolce but from a madrigal of Paschale's 'Io veggio apertamente' (Sig. C ij a).

That Lodge should make this mistake, if mistake it was, of confusing the work of Dolce and Paschale, is curious. For a single poem of one writer to be erroneously attributed to another was by no means an infrequent occurrence, but that as many as four poems should be ascribed to the wrong author seems unlikely. Had these poems of Paschale's appeared in any of the anthologies of *Rime* collected by Dolce, such a confusion on Lodge's part would be understandable and it would provide a satisfactory explanation of his mistake, but none of these poems, nor, indeed, any of Paschale's verse, are included in the *Rime* collected by Dolce to be found in the British Museum. According to Quadrio³, poems ascribed to Paschale appear in only one sixteenth-century anthology, the second part of the *Rime Spirituale* published at Venice in 1550, which would not, therefore, include the above love-lyrics. A possible explanation is that Lodge hoped to give his poems an added interest for his English readers by attributing them to Dolce,

¹ *Rime Volgari di M. Ludovico Paschale*, In Vinegia, 1549.

² The references throughout to Lodge's works are to the Hunterian Club edition.

³ F. S. Quadrio, *Della Storia e Della Ragione d' ogni Poesia*, Milano, 1741, Vol. II, pt. i, p. 355.

well known as a translator and commentator, rather than to their real author, the obscure Paschale. That Lodge, in this same romance, translated one poem from the *Rime Volgari* and ascribed it rightly to Paschale would certainly point to a wilful falsification in the case of the other four poems. The discovery of further borrowings from the *Rime Volgari* in *A Margarite of America* and elsewhere in Lodge's works would strengthen this conclusion.

II. THE EXTENT OF LODGE'S DEBT TO THE 'RIME VOLGARI' OF PASCHALE.

These four poems attributed to Dolce and the one acknowledged translation ('Those glorious lampes that heauen illuminate') do not conclude Lodge's debt to Paschale. Two more poems included in *A Margarite of America* are unacknowledged translations from this writer. The sonnet 'I pine away expecting of the houre' (p. 65) is a translation of Paschale's 'Io mi consumo in aspettando un' hora' (Sig. F i a), and the sonnet 'I see a new sprung sunne that shines more cleerely' (pp. 74-5) of Paschale's 'Io ueggio un nuouo Sol che uie piu splende' (Sig. B iij b). Professor Kastner noted that three of the sonnets in *Phyllis* (1593) were from this same poet, and to these earlier instances of borrowing can be added another of the same date, a sonnet in *William Long beard* (1593), 'That pittty Lord that earst thy heart inflamed' (p. 36), a translation of Paschale's 'Quella pietá Signor che gia t'accese' (Sig. I i b).

Lodge's debt to Paschale is, therefore, much more extensive than has hitherto been recognised. In all he translated eleven poems from the work of this obscure Italian. His debt to Paschale is, indeed, according to the evidence so far collected, much greater than to any other single Italian writer, as great even as his debt to Desportes from whom he borrowed about the same number of poems.

III. SOME FURTHER ITALIAN SOURCES OF LODGE'S VERSE.

From an Italian source came one of the sonnets contributed by Lodge to *The Phoenix Nest*, 'Midst lasting griefes, to haue but short repose' (*Misc. Pieces*, Hunterian Club, p. 9), a translation of the sonnet 'Brieue riposo hauer di lunghi affanni,' attributed in some sixteenth-century anthologies to Pietro Barignano, in others to Vincenzo Quirino¹. Another

¹ Attributed to Barignano in the *Rime Diversi* (collected Domenichi), Venice, 1545-6 and in the *Rime di Diversi Eccellenti Autori Bresciani* (collected Ruscelli), Venice, 1553; to Quirino in the *Rime Diversi* (collected Domenichi), Venice, 1546, in the *Rime Scelte* (Giolito), Vol. 1, Venice, 1565, and in the *Rime di Diversi Eccellenti Autori* (collected Dolce), Venice, 1553.

poem contributed by Lodge to this same miscellany, 'For pittie pretie eies surcease' (*Misc. Pieces*, p. 16), was a translation of an Italian madrigal 'Non più guerra, pietate,' ascribed to Guarini in the *Rime di Diuersi Celebri Poeti Dell' età nostra* published at Bergamo in 1587 (Sig. N 2 a).

Lodge's renderings of these poems of Paschale, Barignano (or Quirino) and Guarini have the qualities common to all his verse translations—they show a competent, though not scholarly, understanding of the original, expressed with Elizabethan freedom. Lodge finds himself in need of greater variety in rhymes than the Italians. Many instances could be cited of liberties taken with single words and phrases which modern literal methods of translations would reject. There are too some expansions of the Italian which necessarily involve some omissions. But in spite of these reservations, Lodge's English versions are close enough to the Italian originals to fall within the category of translations, as the following example will show:

Se 'l foco di sospir noiosi & greui
 Ch' io spargo ogn' hor in questa bassa ualle
 Trouar potesse qualche strada ò calle
 Ch' in cima all' Alpe lo conduca & lieui,
 Arder uedreste le gelate neu
 Et adornarsi le lor nude spalle
 Di uiole uermiglie bianche & gialle
 Hor sott' i giorni nubilosi & greui,

Ma uoi Donna uedete l' empia fiamma
 Che mi strugge per uoi fuor di misura
 Et mi consuma tutto à dramma à dramma,
 Ne però anchor qualche pietosa cura
 De 'l mio tanto martir il cor u' infiamma
 De 'l gel piu fredda, & piu del' alpi dura.

If so those flames I vent when as I sigh,
 Amidst these lowly vallies where I lie,
 Might finde some meanes by swift addresse to flie
 Vnto those Alpine toplesse mountaines high:

Thou shouldest behold their Icie burthens thawe,
 And crimson flowers adorne their naked backs,
 Sweete roses should inrich their winter wracks,
 Against the course of kind and natures lawe.

But you faire Ladie see the furious flame,
 That through your will destroyes me beyond measure,
 Yet in my paines me thinkes you take great pleasure,
 Loth to redeeme or else redresse the same:
 Nor hath your heart compassion of mine illes,
 More cold then snow, more hard then Alpine hils.

There is only one error which shows a definite misunderstanding of an Italian phrase—in the translation of Paschale's sonnet 'Io ueggio un

nuovo Sol che uìè piu splende'—where it is clear that Lodge confused the It. *poggio* (hill) with It. *pioggia* (rain) in his translation of the lines:

Da quel di poggio ò di qualch' arbor' ombra
 Ò qualche nebbia può copprirmi ogn' hora

which runs:

From that a shower a shadow of a tree,
 A foggie mist may safely me protect.

In places Lodge's translation appears less good than it probably actually was through printer's errors and faulty punctuation.

The *sestina* is of interest historically as the first regular *sestina* in English, but although the translation is accurate and, in places, happy, the strictness and monotony of the *sestina* pattern produce an unnatural effect in English. Of the other poems the sonnet above quoted and the lighter pieces ('I see with my hearts bleeding' and 'For pittie pretie eies') are the best. The latter run easily and spontaneously and, like the similar translations of Italian madrigals in *William Long beard*, produce nowhere the effect of a translation.

ALICE WALKER.

CAMBRIDGE.

VAUGHAN AND COWPER

The last in the series of 'satires' included in Cowper's *Poems* (1782), the piece called *Retirement*, is commonly regarded as marking a turning-point in his poetic development—a point at which his interest in external nature begins to show a more positive quality, being no longer simply an aspect of his aversion from the manners and morals of towns. Mr John Bailey, who notices this change in the introduction to his edition of Cowper, is also inclined to find part of its explanation in the influence of Lady Austen, who had 'come into the country for the very purpose of retirement, and fully shared his theories on the subject.'

It is, of course, not surprising to find that in Cowper the increased affection for nature itself is closely associated with the religious strain in his character or even that, at times, it should assume an almost mystical quality, the

cities, humming with a restless crowd,
 Sordid as active, ignorant as loud,

being contrasted with:

regions where, in spite of sin and woe,
 Traces of Eden are still seen below,
 Where mountain, river, forest, field and grove,
 Remind him of his Maker's power and love,

especially as in the earlier part of the eighteenth century notes not greatly dissonant with these had been sounded by poets like Pope and Thomson and Young. Here again, probably, the personality of Lady Austen was also of some moment. Yet it seems almost certain that an earlier literary example, both of interest in nature itself and of a religious and mystical attitude towards it, was among the conditions responsible for the state of mind in which *Retirement* was written. It is known, though not always remembered, that Cowper was acquainted with some of the best poems of Henry Vaughan, since he owned a copy of the 1650 edition, or Part I, of *Silex Scintillans*; it appears, however, to have escaped notice that some fairly definite evidence of this acquaintance may be traced in *Retirement*, in *The Task*, and in *Yardley Oak*. The probability that there was not only some spiritual kinship but an actual contact or communication of poetic ideas between Vaughan and a writer so influential in his turn as Cowper is scarcely negligible by the historian of literature.

Cowper's copy of *Silex Scintillans* is now preserved in the National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth. There is nothing to show at what date the volume came into his possession, but there are evident signs of the interest with which he perused it. Cowper's underlinings and other markings were described by Dr Grosart in *Wales*, Vol. 1, pp. 198-200 (September 1894). But except for the hazardous suggestion that two lines from Vaughan's *Misery* marked by Cowper:

Such is man's life, and such is mine
The worst of men, and yet still thine,

may have stimulated the writing of 'There is a fountain,' Grosart refrained from any attempt to trace any influence of Vaughan upon the later poet.

The suggestion is extremely hazardous because what is in question here is not any point of characteristic thought or utterance or gesture, but one of the commonest sentiments of Christian devotion; and Cowper could of course easily have written that particular poem without ever having heard of Henry Vaughan. Some phrases, or ideas, or sequences of thought more genuinely peculiar to Vaughan must be shown to have correspondency in Cowper's work before anything in the way of real influence can be surmised.

It happens that one of the passages most heavily marked by Cowper is the first stanza of *The World*, the famous poem beginning 'I saw Eternity the other night,' and it seems clear that Cowper's interest was not confined to that stanza; for in *Retirement* some of the more indi-

vidual poetic ideas in *The World* are reflected in ways that can hardly be coincidental. It will be remembered that Vaughan describes his vision of 'Eternity' as being:

Like a great *Ring* of pure and endless light,
 All calm, as it was bright,
 And round beneath it, Time in hours, days, years
 Driv'n by the spheres
 Like a vast shadow mov'd, In which the world
 And all her train were hurl'd.

He goes on to delineate and reprehend some typical worldly characters, 'the doting lover,' with such emblems of his condition as 'his lute, his fancy, and his flights'; 'the darksome States-man,' of whom the description occupies the whole of the second stanza; 'the fearfull miser,' 'the down-right Epicure' and 'the weaker sort' whom 'slight, trivial wares Inslave.' Stanza 4 begins:

Yet some, who all this while did weep and sing,
 And sing, and weep, soar'd up into the *Ring*,
 But most would use no wing.
 O fools (said I), thus to prefer dark night
 Before true light,
 To live in grotts, and caves, and hate the day
 Because it shews the way,...

The poem concludes with a conceit in which the circle of Eternity is identified with the Bridegroom's Ring. Cowper's apparent reminiscence of this poem is perhaps most obvious in ll. 147-164 of *Retirement*:

Op'ning the map of God's extensive plan
 We find a little isle, this life of man
Eternity's unknown expanse appears
 Circling around and limiting his *years*.
 The busy race examine, and explore
 Each creek and *cavern* of the dang'rous shore,
 With care collect what in their eyes excels,
 Some shining pebbles, and some weeds and shells;
 Thus laden, dream that they are rich and great,
 And happiest he that groans beneath his weight:

A few forsake the throng; with lifted eyes
 Ask wealth of heav'n, and gain a real prize—
 Truth, wisdom, grace, and peace like that above,
 Seal'd with his *signet* whom they serve and love.

Cowper proceeds to describe various types that seek retirement for one motive, or another, and among the figures more fully treated are those of the lover and of the statesman, in the same order as in Vaughan's poem.

It seems probable, also, that other poems by Vaughan entered at this

time into Cowper's inspiration. Lines 19–27 of *Corruption*, for instance, are marked by him:

He sigh'd for *Eden*, and would often say
Ah! what bright days were those?
 Nor was Heav'n cold unto him; for each day
 The valley or the Mountain
 Afforded visits, and still *Paradise* lay
 In some green shade or fountain.
 Angels lay leiger here; each Bush and Cel,
 Each Oke and high-way knew them,
 Walk but the fields...

and they may well have been in his mind when he wrote the passage already quoted at the beginning of this article

To regions where, in spite of sin and woe etc..

Nor is it improbable that Cowper's image, in *Retirement*, ll. 63–66, of the

thousand insect forms,
 These hatch'd, and those resuscitated worms,
 New life ordain'd and brighter scenes to share,
 Once prone on earth, now buoyant upon air,

owes something to Vaughan's description in *Resurrection and Immortality* of the 'drowsy silkworm' which he has seen to 'creep

From that lazy sleep,
 And in weak, infant hummings chime, and knell
 About her silent cell,
 Until at last, full with the vital ray,
 She winged away...

(ll. 6–10).

But the signs of relationship between the two poets are not confined to *Retirement*. In Book I of *The Task* (1785), when Cowper has escaped from his prescribed theme of 'The Sofa' and is concerned with the more congenial business of description, he writes (ll. 270–273):

Hence, ankle-deep in moss and flowery thyme,
 We mount again, and feel at every step
 Our foot half sunk in hillocks green and soft,
 Raised by the mole, the miner of the soil,

proceeding immediately (and a little strangely) to compare the mole with persons occupying high positions:

He, not unlike the great ones of mankind
 Disfigures earth, and, plotting in the dark,
 Toils much to earn a monumental pile,
 That may record the mischiefs he has done.

Knowing what we do of Cowper's interest in Vaughan's *The World*, we may well ask whether this comparison would have occurred to Cowper so easily if it had not been for Vaughan's lines (23–25) in that poem about 'the darksome States-man':

Yet dig'd the Mole, and lest his ways be found
 Workt under ground,
 Where he did clutch his prey,...

A little further on, in the paragraph beginning at l. 367, Cowper enlarges upon the theme that change and apparent hardship are the conditions of physical and moral well-being:

By ceaseless action all that is subsists.
Constant rotation of the unwearied wheel
That Nature rides upon maintains her health,
Her beauty, her fertility. She dreads
An instant's pause, and lives but while she moves.
Its own revolency upholds the world.
Winds from all quarters agitate the air,
And fit the limpid element for use,
Else noxious: oceans, rivers, lakes, and streams,
All feel the freshening impulse, and are cleansed
By restless undulation; even the oak
Thrives by the rude concussion of the storm.

Vaughan's *Affliction* is not among the pieces marked in Cowper's copy of *Silex Scintillans*, but it is not difficult to believe that this piece was more or less consciously in his mind when this part of *The Task* was written:

Vicissitude plaies all the game,
Nothing that stirs,
Or hath a name,
But waits upon this wheel,...

(ll. 29-32)

and a little before (ll. 21-26):

Were all the year one constant Sun-shine, wee
Should have no flowres,
All would be drought, and leanness; not a tree
Would make us bowres;
Beauty consists in colours; and that's best
Which is not fixt, but flies, and flowes;....

Cowper returned to this theme in *Yardley Oak*, in a manner again suggesting indebtedness to Vaughan, though the thought is developed a little further:

Change is the diet, on which all subsist,
Created changeable, and change at last
Destroys them .

Calm and alternate storm, moisture and draught,
Invigorate by turns the springs of life
In all that live, plant, animal, and man,
And in conclusion mar them.

It would not be difficult to indicate other passages in Cowper's poems wherein Vaughan's influence may possibly be traced. In fact when the relationship has been recognised in a few fairly definite and convincing instances it is safer to look for its working in more general respects, and more relevant to enquire how far Vaughan's poems may have been a determining influence in Cowper's later development. To what extent, for example, may the final paragraphs of Book v of *The Task* ('Acquaint

thyself with God' etc.) be directly related to Vaughan's *Rules and Lessons* (of which Cowper marked ll. 3-4 and 7-12)? Certainly there were many other factors which might have encouraged Cowper to find pleasure in external Nature and to approach its manifestations in a spirit analogous to Vaughan's. But though we may be unable now to define the scope of this influence, it seems to have been real and to have received less attention than it deserves.

L. C. MARTIN.

LIVERPOOL.

SWINBURNE AND WALT WHITMAN

Of all the recantations and repudiations which Swinburne was led to pronounce in his later years, none has perhaps attracted more attention and censure than his so-called repudiation of Walt Whitman in 1887¹. It has been asserted: (a) that this attack was incompatible with his earlier praise of the poet; (b) that this unaccountable change in his attitude was altogether due to Watts-Dunton's influence. It is difficult to accept these two statements when one studies the case in the light of Swinburne's works and correspondence, and especially in the light of a page of criticism which has remained unpublished, or rather unidentified, for nearly sixty years.

Swinburne's first introduction to Whitman probably dates from 1862. In this year he writes enthusiastically to Lord Houghton about *A Voice from the Sea*²; in 1866 he expresses to the same correspondent his warm appreciation of *Drum Taps*. However, the last pages of the critical essay on *William Blake* (composed circa 1864) contain a more reticent and elaborate statement; Swinburne recognises that Whitman's (like Blake's) poetry has 'the melody and laxity of a fitful stormwind' although he has no 'place or time or wish' to dwell on the shortcomings and errors of either poet. In 1867 Nichol compels Swinburne to admit that even *Drum Taps* has its weaknesses³. Then comes the beautiful poem published in 1871 which is dedicated to the 'strong-winged soul':

With consonant ardours of chords
That pierce men's souls as with swords
And hale them hearing along....⁴

It is of this poem that one chiefly thinks when one speaks of Swinburne's later 'apostasy.'

¹ 'Whitmania,' *Fortnightly Review*, August 1887. Reprinted in *Studies in Prose and Poetry*.

² Letter to Houghton, 18 August 1862. Quoted in Gosse's *Life*, p. 95 (only part of Swinburne's letters to Lord Houghton have been printed).

³ Letter to Nichol, July 1867, privately printed.

⁴ *Songs Before Sunrise: To Walt Whitman in America*.

The pamphlet entitled *Under the Microscope* (1872) is far more critical: we are told that there is in Whitman a poet and a formalist, and that the latter is unworthy of the praise deserved by the former; and although Swinburne is entirely at one with Whitman on life and politics, yet 'it is not enough to have a new creed, you must deliver it well,' and some of the American poet's 'undigested formulas' are worse than Pope's or Boileau's. The critical attitude is still marked in a letter of 1875 in which it is stated that 'when Whitman is not speaking bad prose he sings, and when he sings at all he sings well'¹; and it definitely hardens in 1876 when he is declared to be writing 'such damned and damnable rubbish'². The storm is gathering when in 1885 Swinburne, while professing to retain admiration for 'not a little' of Whitman's earlier works, denounces his 'habit of vague and flatulent language'³; and with the sultry days of August 1887 came the cloudburst, the article 'Whitmania,' from which endless amazing quotations have been and could be made to support the view of an actual recantation; the following sentence, though less striking and vituperative than many others, is perhaps clearest and most definite: 'I never have meant to imply...that I regarded Mr Whitman as a poet or a thinker in the proper sense.'

This rapid collation of the most important documents is sufficient to lighten Watts's responsibility considerably and to show that Swinburne's reticence grew normally and logically and did not spring into existence like a monstrous toadstool. However, there seems to be a break in his attitude before and after 1871; *Under the Microscope* stands in clear contrast to *William Blake* and the review of *l'Homme qui rit* in that respect. But this is merely an appearance. As early as 1867 Swinburne was making on Whitman's poetry the very reservations which he was to develop later. The gap can be filled and his intellectual attitude proved to be continuous.

In 1868 J. C. Hotten published a volume of 'Poems by Walt Whitman, selected and edited by W. M. Rossetti'; the editor in a prefatory note attempts to clear Whitman of some charges, but first, 'not to slur over

¹ Letter to E. C. Stedman, 20 February 1875. *The Letters of A. C. Swinburne* (Heinemann), London 1918, I, p. 201.

² Letter to Lord Houghton, 29 March 1876. *Letters*, I, p. 279. In an unpublished letter (dated 4 April 1876), which I have just come across, I find a longer and more significant passage which I am given permission to quote here: 'Pity he [Whitman] has no friend at hand to keep him from writing such damned nonsense about poetry and verse as I saw quoted in the Examiner—the most blatant bray of impotent and impudent ignorance I ever heard except from the throat of Bavius-Buchanan or Maevius-Maitland. These are the things that make it difficult always to remember and compromising often to assert the existence of his really high qualities.' This supplies a new 'landmark' which is by no means to be neglected.

³ Letter to Edmund Gosse, 21 February 1885. *Letters*, II, p. 153.

his defects' he will 'extract some sentences from a letter which a friend, most highly entitled to form and express an opinion on any poetic question—one too who abundantly upholds the greatness of Walt Whitman as a poet—has addressed to me....' This friend was Swinburne.

Since September 1867 W. M. Rossetti had been corresponding with Swinburne about his intended volume of selections from Whitman. On 10 October 1867 he informed Swinburne that he had 'bodily translated into his preface' a passage from one of his letters about Whitman's 'bluster,' and had quoted it as the opinion of a friend 'highly entitled to express his opinion,' etc. The letter is in the library of Mr T. J. Wise whom I have to thank for allowing me to examine the Swinburne-Rossetti correspondence. It clearly proves the authorship of the passage which I now quote:

I don't think that you quite put strength enough into your blame on one side, while you make at least enough of minor faults or eccentricities. To me it seems always that Whitman's great flaw is a fault of debility, not an excess of strength—I mean his bluster. His own personal and national self-reliance and arrogance, I need not tell you, I applaud and sympathize and rejoice in; but the frothy and blatant ebullience of feeling and speech, at times, is very feeble for so great a poet of so great a people. He is in part certainly the poet of democracy; but not wholly, because he tries so openly to be, and asserts so violently that he is—always as if he was fighting the case out on a platform. This is the only thing I really or greatly dislike or revolt from. On the whole my admiration and enjoyment of his greatness grows keener and warmer every time I think of him.

(W. M. Rossetti altered 'frothy and blatant' to 'blatant' and 'very feeble' to 'feeble'.)

This interesting page is not merely a sound piece of criticism; it may not unfairly be considered as the key and justification to Swinburne's whole attitude: here are, expressed or implied, all the main points upon which Swinburne will fasten later in his franker and less measured censure of Whitman; and this short letter is moreover in strict accordance with Swinburne's æsthetic theories in the 'sixties. Some adjectives ('frothy,' 'blatant,' etc.) are strong enough to have been borrowed from 'Whitmania.' If we take into consideration that between 1867 and the publication of the 'recantation' many years had elapsed, that age and deafness had brought irritability, that a man's style changes with the years, that all that Whitman had published was not equally excellent, and if we carefully add to this mixture of considerations three or four drops of Wattsian influence, it strikes me that the revolution (or evolution) in Swinburne's attitude has been very sufficiently accounted for.

GEORGES LAFOURCADE.

LONDON.

SOME NEW ARTHURIAN MANUSCRIPTS IN THE BODLEIAN LIBRARY

The invaluable collection of manuscripts bequeathed to the Bodleian, Oxford, by Francis Douce seems to have been partially neglected by students of French Arthurian Literature, in which it is nevertheless of considerable importance. The following six manuscripts cover so wide a field in French Arthurian Romance that it is hoped this note will be of use in bringing them to the notice of scholars.

Douce 178. *Estoire del Saint Graal* and *Estoire de Merlin*. Illuminated capitals, painted initials. Grotesques. Several miniatures. Fourteenth century; parchment; 0^m320 × 0^m215; iv + 423 leaves (numbered 417, but fols. 60, 65, 125 are double). Fols. 64–148, 214–end are in a different handwriting from the rest, while on fols. 2, 3, 6–9, 27–48, 150, 157, 160–7, the handwriting is smaller. Two cols. a page. Note on front leaf in handwriting of F. Douce.

(1) Fols. 1^r *a*–148^r *a*. The *Graal* attributed to Robert de Borron. Complete version, with several minor variations from the text of B.M. Add. 10292, notably in a reference (fol. 139^r *b*) to the *estoire del brut*, where it agrees with B.M. Add. 32125. Begins: 'cil qui la hautece et la seignorie de si haute estoire.' Ends: 'et retorne a une autre branche que len apelle merlin quil conuient aioust[er] a fine force ensemble avec lestoire del seint graal por ce que branche en est e i apartient et commence missire Robert de Borron cele branche en cel maniere.'

(2) Fols. 149^r *a*–417^r *b* (as numbered). *Estoire de Merlin*. Complete version, save that, as fols. 355^v *b* and 366^r are blank, it omits the part corresponding to fol. 189^r *a*–^v *a* of B.M. Add. 10292 (Sommer¹, Vol. II, p. 377, l. 31–p. 378, l. 32). Begins: 'Mult fu iries li anemiss quant n[ost]re sires ot este en anfer.' Ends: 'Et ce fu celui qui le trai e par cui il perdi le chastel de trebe. Einssi comme li contes le uos deuisera ca auant Ci fine lestoire de merlin,' followed by a line, crossed out by the scribe: 'Apres uient la marche de Gaule,' and in printed capitals: 'A ANNE DE GRAVILLE SVIS.'

Douce 189. *Mort Artu*, and a fragment of the Prose *Tristan*. Painted initials, several ornamented capitals. Epilogue to the *Mort Artu* in red lettering. Fourteenth century; parchment; 0^m310 × 0^m210; iv + 78 leaves in two cols. Handwriting of the *Mort Artu* about half a century earlier than that of the *Tristan*. Three notes on the front leaves, the third in the handwriting of F. Douce.

¹ *The Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, edited by H. Oskar Sommer, 7 vols. Washington, 1908–13.

(1) Fols. 1^{ro} a-64^{vo} b. *Mort Artu*. Complete version, but abridged slightly as compared with B.N. fr. 342. Begins: 'Après ce qe maistres Gautiers map ot aporte(r) aidez deus aue[n]tures dou sanct graal.' Ends: 'E finist si son liure si oltreement que après ce nen poroit nus contier que ne mentist de totes choses Explicit la mort lo roi artu.'

(2) Fols. 65^{ro} a-78^{vo} b. Part of the Prose *Tristan*, corresponding to §§ 534-551, 568-570 in Löseth's analysis¹. The text is fairly close to that of B.N. fr. 772, although often following B.N. fr. 99 (in Löseth, § 538), 336, 757, 760, and, especially in the epilogue, 1463, with which it ends. The names 'Lucez dol Grant,' 'Rubert de Baron' and 'Gautier Maz' may be noted; also a reference absent in Löseth: 'T[r]istan se fu une grant piece deduit a larpe e il ot h[a]rpe le lay del chieurefoill' (fol. 70^{vo} a)². Begins: 'Or dit li contes qe ne d[e]mora mie gra[m]ment qe li rois marc auoit assegie le rois artu dedens kamaalot.' Ends: 'moi merce m[o]lt lou Roi henri mon seignor de ce qil loe le mie[n] liure e de ce qil li done si grant priz. Explicit la mort monsingnor T[r]ista[n].'

Douce 199. Parts of the *Lancelot* and *Queste*, attributed to Map. Coloured initials. Large, illuminated capitals, miniatures and vignettes at beginning and end of chapters. Headings and ends of chapters in red letters. Fourteenth century; parchment; 0^m355 × 0^m250; iv + 334 leaves, in one col. (numbered 325, but fols. 10, 70, 85, 125, 145, 150, 190, 265, 310 are double). Same handwriting throughout, varying in size.

(1) Fols. 1^{ro}-299^{vo}. The second part of the *Lancelot* proper (the *Agravaïn*). Corresponds, with only minor variations, to B.M. Add. 10293, fols. 251^{ro} c-383^{vo} a (Sommer, Vol. v). Begins: 'Ici comence li contes a parler dagrauain li bon ch[e]ualie[r]. Ci endroit dit li contes que q[uan]t agrauains se fu de ses conpegnons partis.' Ends: 'que plus nen parole a ceste foiz e comence ia endroit listoire del saint graal e dit en icele maniere.'

(2) Fols. 300^{ro}-322^{vo} (as numbered). Fragment of the *Queste*, attributed to Map. Incomplete at end. Many variations from text of B.M. Add. 10294, fols. 1^{ro} a-11^{ro} b (Sommer, Vol. vi, pp. 3-39, l. 18). It gives an enlarged version of B.M. Add. 10294, fols. 10^{vo} b-11^{ro} b. Begins: 'A la ueille de pentecoste quant li compeignon de la table reonde furent uenus a camaalot.' Ends: 'sa bie[n] e sun estre si oltreement quil ni cuide riens o(ri)blier si trouue li hermites.'

Douce 215. Fragments of the *Lancelot* (*Agravaïn*), *Queste*, and *Mort Artu*. Ornamented initials, border ornamentation. Large, illuminated

¹ *Le Roman en prose de Tristan. Analyse critique d'après les manuscrits de Paris*, par E. Löseth, Paris, 1891.

² It occurs however in B.N. fr. 772.

capitals, miniatures and vignettes at heads of chapters. Titles in red. Fourteenth century; parchment (fols. 40-44 vellum); 0^m400 × 0^m285; v + 45 leaves. The sections devoted to the *Lancelot*, the *Queste* and the *Mort Artu* are in different handwriting. Two cols. a page.

(1) Fols. 1^{ro} a-8^{vo} b. Fragment of the second part of the *Lancelot*, corresponding to fols. 251^{ro} c-258^{ro} b of B.M. Add. 10293 (Sommer, Vol. v, pp. 3-23, l. 11), which it follows fairly closely. Begins: 'Chi endroit dist li contes ke quant agrauains se fu partis de ses compaignons.' Ends: 'dame fait il iou demourai en tel maniere q[e] iou.'

(2) Fols. 9^{ro} a-39^{vo} b, and also fol. 45. A fragment of the *Queste* attributed to Map. Leaves are missing after fols. 21, 25, 29. Only slight variations from B.M. Add. 10294, of which it corresponds to fols. 19^{vo} a-29^{ro} a; 29^{vo} b-32^{vo} b; 35^{ro} c-38^{ro} a; 40^{vo} b-47^{ro} a; 52^{vo} a-53^{ro} b (Sommer, Vol. vi, p. 68, l. 30-p. 102, l. 35; p. 105, l. 16-p. 116, l. 4; p. 126, l. 4-p. 136, l. 20; p. 147, l. 3-p. 173, l. 18; p. 196, l. 14-p. 199). Begins: 'iusca eure de none · mais si tost comme chele eure fu passee emporta li lyons le lionchel.' Ends: 'si se taist atant li contes ke plus ne dit des auentures del saint graal.'

(3) Fols. 40^{ro} a-44^{vo} b. Fragment of the *Mort Artu*, corresponding, with slight variations, to B.M. Add. 10294, fols. 92^{vo} c-95^{vo} a (Sommer, Vol. vi, p. 375, l. 6-p. 386, l. 33; and pp. 240-257 of Bruce's edition¹). Begins: 'Atant recoumencha la meslee g[ra]nt e merueilleuse e gallegantins li galois qi estoit ch[eua][ie]rs preus e hardis.' Ends: 'et y auoit une petite chapelle ancienne et il descent a lentree et oste so[n] heaume · E quant il.'

Douce 303. *Estoire del Saint Graal*. Ornamented capitals, gilt edges. Grotesques. Two miniatures and one vignette. Thirteenth century; vellum; 0^m272 × 0^m196; iv + 112 leaves in two cols. Small handwriting in brown ink; according to a pencil note on the front leaf, the MS. is in the Picard dialect. Fol. 87 defective in lower right-hand corner. Complete version; minor variations from B.M. Add. 10292 (Sommer, Vol. i). It does not contain the reference to the *estoire del brut* (Douce 178, fol. 139^{ro} b). Begins: 'Chil qui se tient e iuge au plus petit e au plus pecheor de tous.' Ends: 'sil est nus qui le uos die · Or nos consalt diex e sainte marie AMEN. EXPLICIT LE COMMENCEMENT DEL ESTOIRE DEL SAINT GRAAL ET CHI APRES UIENT LESTOIRE DE MERLIN · DIEX NOS MAINT TOUS A BONE FIN · AMEN ·'

Douce 379. Composed of three MSS. (1) Sixteenth century; paper; vi + 100 leaves in one col.; cursive script. A collection of poems pre-

¹ *Mort Artu*, edited by J. D. Bruce, Halle, 1910.

sented to celebrate a feast at Rouen, Dec. 14, 1511. (2) Fourteenth century; parchment; 12 leaves (numbered 105–116) of small Gothic script in one col. A fragment of the *Gesta Romanorum*. (3) Fourteenth century; parchment; 0^m240 × 0^m155; two leaves (numbered 117 and 118), mutilated at the edges; larger Gothic script in two cols.; ornamented red and blue initials. The leaves are fastened together wrongly; the fragment begins at fol. 118 v^o, continues with fols. 118 r^o, then 117 r^o, and ends at 117 v^o. A fragment of the *Queste* attributed to Map. Catalogued by Madan¹ as probably a fragment of the *Lancelot*. It seems to be a better version than B.M. Add. 10294, fols. 5 v^o c–6 v^o c (Sommer, Vol. vi, p. 21, l. 10–p. 24, l. 19), to which it corresponds, with several variations. Begins (fol. 118 v^o a): '[e]stoit beaus · il sasistrent desour un arbre e lors demanda Gal[aad].’ Ends (fol. 117 v^o b): ‘a ii anz que iosep da[ri]matie le gentis ch[eualie]r que despan[di].’

E. S. MURRELL.

NOTES ON THE GOTHIC CALENDAR (COD. AMBROS. A)

(i) *ana gutþiudai*.

The most obvious translation of *ana gutþiudai* is M. Heyne's rendering 'für das gotenvolk' (see H. Achelis in *Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wissenschaft* 1, pp. 308–38), the Gothic words thus corresponding to the Greek ἐπὶ τοῖς Γότθοις. *Ana* usually represents the Greek ἐπί, whilst *in* translates ἐν, as in *Eph.* iii, 15, which is at the same time a typical example of Gothic translation-technique, ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς, *in himina jah ana airþai*, whereas *Eph.* i, 10 reads τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, *þo ana himinam jahþo ana airþai*.

Instances are not wanting, however, where *ana* translates ἐν, even in the absence of any idea of motion, as in *Matt.* xxvi, 69 ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἔξω ἐκάθητο ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ, *iþ Païtrus uta sat ana rohsnai*; *Gal.* vi, 17 ἐγὼ γὰρ τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματί μου βαστάζω, *unte ik stakins Iesuis ana leika meinamma baira*. I believe that *ana gutþiudai* provides yet another instance of this use of *ana* for ἐν, and that the Gothic is an idiomatic representation of the Greek ἐν Γοτθίῳ. After all, it is not usual to describe martyrs as having died for their people. Christ gave his life for the world; martyrs die for Christ, ὑπὲρ Ἰησοῦ, *pro Christo*, not

¹ F. Madan, *Summary Catalogue of the Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, Vol. iv, p. 613, no. 21954, Oxford, 1897.

pro populo or *pro mundo*. On the other hand the mention of the place of their martyrdom is perfectly natural, and the three menologies quoted by Achelis all speak of τῶν ἐν Γοθία μαρτυρησάντων.

Gothic idiom sometimes substitutes the name of the people for that of the country, as in 2 Cor. xi, 10 ἐν τοῖς κλίμασιν τῆς Ἀχατίας, *in landa Akaje*; Mk. vii. 24 εἰς τὰ μεθόρια Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος, *in markos Ture jah Seidone*. This substitution became an idiomatic necessity in the case of Γοθία, and *ana gutþiudai*, rather than *in gutþiudai*, would seem to be the idiomatic equivalent of ἐν Γοθία, *ana* here approximating to the sense 'among,' the phrase being comparable to the MHG. type *ze den Burgonden*.

(ii) *bilaiþ*.

October 29: *gaminþi martwre þize bi Werekan papan jah Batwin bilaiþ. aiklesjons fullaizos ana gutþiudai gabrannidai*.

Heyne translates 'Es dauerte das gedächtnis der märtyrer durch den bischof (papst) Wereka und durch Batwins. Sie sind verbrannt worden für das gotenvolk der katholischen kirche.' Massmann, in his edition of the *Skeireins* (1834), p. 95, note 7 on the word *fullaizos*, says 'schwerlich, wie Mai, übersetzt *catholicæ*...der sinn kann nur sein "*in plena ecclesia combusti*."' Bernhardt, *Vulfilas*, p. 605, note, says 'ich nehme vielmehr den genitiv partitiv, "aus der gefüllten kirche verbrannt."'

If we accept the usual punctuation and take *bilaiþ* as the preterite of **bileiban*, we may render the first part of the entry thus: Μνήμη τῶν μαρτύρων τῶν περὶ Οὐήρικαν πρεσβύτερον καὶ Βατουίνον διέμεινεν (διαμεμένηκεν), 'The 29th has remained as a memorial of the martyrs who were with Wereka the priest and Batwins,' or, possibly, 'The memory of the martyrs...has persisted.' This leaves us with the difficulty of explaining what follows. 'They were burnt in Gothia in (from) the full church' does not sound convincing, whilst a reasonably probable equivalent, say, ἐκκλησίας πληρουμένης ἐν Γοθία κατακεκαυμένοι would require at least the alteration of *fullaizos* to *gafullidaizos*, as well as our consent to recognise this as another genitive absolute in Gothic in support of the doubtful instance Mk. xvi, 1 διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου, *inwisandins sabbate dagis*.

Gabelentz-Loebe referred *bilaiþ* (which Castiglione had translated *ministro*) to *hlaiþs*, explaining *bilaiþ* = *gahlaiþa*, that is *συμμαθητής, συστρατιώτης*. 'Wereka, priest, and Batwins his colleague.' May I be allowed to offer yet another conjecture in an endeavour to justify the two following words? *Bilaiþ* could very well be a noun from **bileiban*

(cf. *gaþrask* from *þriskan*), and I suggest that it may be the Gothic equivalent of the Greek τὸ λείψανον, 'a piece left, wreck, remnant, relic'; also in the plural τὰ λείψανα, 'relics,' Lat. *reliquiæ*. *Gabrannidai* need not detain us long; it is most probably corrupt; the scribe has made so many mistakes that he has only himself to blame if we take *gabrannidai* to be a homoioteleutic error for *gabrannidaize* or, to agree with *aikklesjons*, *gabrannidaizos*. We can now turn the whole entry into Greek thus: Μνήμη τῶν μαρτύρων τῶν περὶ Οὐήρεκαν πρεσβύτερον καὶ Βατουίνον, τὸ λείψανον ἐκκλησίας πλήρους, ἐν Γοθθία κατακεκαυμένων, 'The memory of the martyrs who were with Wereka the priest and Batwins—all that is left of a church full of people—burnt in Gothia.' Or, omitting the second comma and reading *gabrannidaizos* (κατακεκαυμένης), 'The memory of the martyrs who were with Wereka the priest and Batwins is all that remains of a full church burnt in Gothia.'

It may even be that *bilaif* represents the plural τὰ λείψανα, although we should expect this to be represented by a plural form; cf. *Mk.* viii, 8 *περίσσευμα*, *Rom.* ix, 27 *κατάλειμμα*, which are both rendered by the plural *laibos*. Taking *bilaif* in this sense, with a stop after *Batwin*, the entry is again perfectly intelligible. 'On this day we honour (a) the memory of the martyrs who died with Wereka and Batwins; (b) the relics of the full church burnt in Gothia.'

That the relics were collected, and that they found a resting-place in Cyzicus, appears from two of the three menologies quoted by Achelis. The first account (p. 319) reads as follows: Τούτων τὰ λείψανα συνήγαγε Γαάθα, ἡ βασίλισσα τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν Γόθων...καταλιπούσα τὴν Δουλκίλλαν εἰς Κύζικον ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ καὶ Θεοδοσίου, καὶ δέδωκεν ἐκ τῶν λειψάνων μερίδας ἐν πόλει ἀγιασμόν. The second source quoted is very similar: Τούτων τὰ λείψανα συνήγαγεν ἡ σύμβιος τοῦ ἐτέρου ἄρχοντος τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν Γόθων...πάλιν ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν χώραν, καταλιπούσα τῇ θυγατρὶ τὰ λείψανα. ἥτις εἰς Κύζικον ἀπελθοῦσα δέδωκεν ἐξ αὐτῶν μερίδα τῇ πόλει καὶ οὕτως ἐτελειώθη.

The author of this account, who was at pains to record the possession by the town of Cyzicus of relics of these Gothic martyrs, does not tell us whether any other place was equally honoured with a share of the same relics, although the words ἐκ τῶν λειψάνων μερίδας, ἐξ αὐτῶν μερίδα, lead us to infer that only a portion of them was deposited at Cyzicus. It is possible, therefore, that the place of origin of the Gothic calendar also possessed some of the relics, and in that case, if this conjecture is correct, it is most probably to these that reference is made.

On the other hand, when the Goths, apparently during their sojourn

in Thrace, compiled for themselves—perhaps for the first time—a calendar of their own martyrs and of such other saints as had a claim on the gratitude of their church, they would probably make use of any Greek sources that came to their hand. Thus the use of local sources has been made to account for the inclusion of the forty women of Beroa, who were not Goths (Achelis, p. 317), and of Andreas ‘the apostle of Thrace and Scythia’ (*ibid.* p. 333).

Similarly, the mention of the ‘relics of a full church burnt in Gothia,’ supposing *bilaij* stands for *τὰ λείψανα*, may point to the use, by the compilers, of a menology or calendar connected with the worshippers of Cyzicus, whose chief interest in the Gothic martyrs would be in the fact that a portion of the holy relics lay enshrined in their church.

G. FRIEDRICHSEN.

LONDON.

REVIEWS

Cynewulf's Part in our Beowulf. By ALBERT STANBURROUGH COOK. (*Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Vol. xxvii, pp. 385-406.) New Haven, Connecticut. 1925. 60 cents.

Professor A. S. Cook's pamphlet deals with the much-debated question of the relationship between Hroþgar's 'sermon' to Beowulf (*Beowulf*, 1724-68) and certain portions of the *Christ* of Cynewulf, viz. (1) ll. 659-82, describing the gifts conferred by God, (2) 683-5, containing a warning against the excessive pride engendered by abundance of gifts, and (3) 756-77, 779-92, admonishing us against the wounds of sin inflicted by the Devil and his servants.

Beowulf, 1724-68, together with the opening part of Hroþgar's congratulatory speech to Beowulf (1700-9), was assigned to 'a final interpolator' by Müllenhoff, as far back as 1869. In 1892, Sarrazin pointed out the parallels between Hroþgar's address to Beowulf and the above-mentioned passages in the *Christ*, concluding:

Wer nun noch berücksichtigt dass drei gedanken (Gifts of God to men, dangers of pride, and the warning against the wounds inflicted by the darts of the Evil One)... wird zugeben müssen, dass diese combination von übereinstimmungen nicht zufällig sein kann, dass vielmehr die eine dichtung durch die andere beeinflusst sein muss.

Sarrazin, as is well known, held that the *Christ*, or at any rate Part II of it, was earlier in date than *Beowulf*, and was therefore able to account for the similarities in question by the theory that the Cynewulfian lines were more or less consciously present to the mind of the author of *Beowulf*. But as Sarrazin's opinions on the relative date of *Beowulf* and the *Christ* have not met with general approval, his explanation of the parallelism cannot be accepted.

The question has, however, been recently re-opened by a greater scholar than Sarrazin; and it is to certain remarks on the subject in Professor Klaeber's masterly edition of *Beowulf* that we owe Professor Cook's interesting brochure. Klaeber's view is as follows:

That the famous Cynewulf was acquainted with *Beowulf* is to be inferred from the character of certain parallel passages occurring especially in *Elene* and in the short *Fates of the Apostles*. The case will be strengthened if we include in the list of his poems—as seems quite reasonable—all of *Christ* and *Guðlac B*, perhaps also *Guðlac A*....In *Christ* III, 1550, we come across the phrase *sawele weard*, which by its explanatory variation *lifes wisdom* (1551) helps us to understand the real force of the analogous expression, *Beow.* 1741 f., *se weard*....*sawele hyrde*....That the extended enumeration, *Beow.* 1763 ff., is entirely in the manner of Cynewulf should not be overlooked in this connection.

Such being the case, we can hardly refuse acceptance to the most natural explanation that offers, viz. that Cynewulf's own hand is to be detected in portions of that homiletic passage in *Beowulf*. This does not mean, of course, that we should... regard Cynewulf as the redactor of *Beowulf*....But it is entirely possible, and more than that, that Cynewulf was sufficiently interested in this speech of Hroþgar's to alter and interpolate it in accordance with his own views and literary predilections (Klaeber, *Beowulf*, pp. cxiv-cxvi. Cf. *ibid.* note on 1700-84).

Any opinion of Professor Klaeber is worthy of the deepest respect, but in this instance I entirely agree with Professor Cook's comment,

that resemblances between two poems, A and B, belonging to successive periods of a literature, necessarily imply that the relevant portion of A was written by the author of B is surely a venturesome conclusion.

Professor Cook (following Dietrich) cogently points out that Cynewulf was chiefly indebted to the Bible and to Gregory the Great for the passages under consideration, and asks,

What additions to his fame could he (Cynewulf) expect from an anonymous contribution to a poem which as it lay before him may already have been in existence, with a reputation of its own, for half or three-quarters of a century?...Is there any evidence, or indeed any presumption...that he was to that extent infatuated with a detail of his own work, for the matter of which he was indebted, in the eyes of his peers, to another, and that other perhaps the most familiar of all writers outside the Bible?

I am of opinion that Professor Cook has adduced sufficient evidence to warrant us concluding that it is unnecessary to assume that Cynewulf had any share in the authorship of Hroþgar's address to Beowulf. But his case is even stronger than appears in the pamphlet. Extremely close parallels with the passages in *Beowulf* and the *Christ* under discussion are, as Professor Cook well knows, to be found in three other Old English poems; I refer of course to *The Gifts of Men*, *The Dispositions of Men*, and *The Fates of Men* (Grein-Wülker, pp. 140-51). Space does not permit me to quote more than one or two extracts:

Fela bið on foldan forðgesynra
geongra geofona, þa þa gæstberend
wegað in gewitte, swa her weoruda God
Meotud meahum swið monnum dæleð,
syleð sundorgiefe, sendeð wide
agne spede, þara æghwylc mot
dryhtwuniendra dæl onfon.... (The Gifts of Men, 1-7.)

Nænig eft þæs swiðe þurh snyttrucræft
in þeode þrym þisses lifes
forð gestigeð, þæt him folces weard
þurh his halige giefe hider onsende
wise geþohtas 7 woruldcræftas
under anes meahum ealle forlæte,
þy-læs he for wlence wuldorgeofona ful
mon mode swið of gemete hweorfe.... (Ibid. 18-25.)

This is followed by a 'sum-passage,' which closely resembles *Christ*, 659-82.

Þæt mæg æghwylc mon eape geþencan,
se þe hine læteþ on þas lænan tid
amyrran his gemyndum modes gælsan....
(The Dispositions of Men, 9-12.)

Swa beoþ modsefan
dalum gedæled, sindon dryhtguman
ungelice. Sum on oferhygdo
þrymme þringeþ, þrinteþ him on innan
ungemede madmod: sindan to manige þæt!
Bið þæt æfponca eal gefylled
feondes fligepilum, facenscarwum. (Ibid. 21-27.)

Anyone who reads these three poems through (particularly the first two) cannot fail to be struck by the fact that they present resemblances as close, or even closer, to the relevant portions of the *Christ* as Hroþgar's speech to Beowulf. But we need not proceed to argue from this that Cynewulf had a hand in *The Gifts of Men*, etc., or even that these poems were suggested by the passage in Cynewulf. There is too great a tendency to assign the extant corpus of Anglo-Saxon poetry to the few authors whose names are known to us. Application of the time-honoured principle known as 'Occam's razor' will rather lead us to assume that the author of *Beowulf*, Cynewulf, and the writer or writers of the other three poems had all read the Bible, and studied to profit the very popular homiletic writings of Gregory the Great, and that they blended suggestions got from these sources with ideas more peculiarly their own.

The second part of Professor Cook's paper is devoted to two suggestive Homeric parallels to Hroþgar's discourse—Nestor's speech to Antilochus (*Il.* xxiii) and the speech of Odysseus to Amphinomus (*Od.* xviii).

SOUTHAMPTON.

S. J. CRAWFORD.

Mittelenglische Originalurkunden 1405–30. Herausgegeben von H. M. FLASDIECK. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1926. 110 pp. 5 M.

Not the least of Professor Morsbach's services to learning is his edition of twenty-six fifteenth-century documents (1923). Professor Flasdieck ably continues the good work. The excellent little book before us contains one Kentish document (c. 1371), and fourteen documents of the fifteenth century, in various dialects—all from MSS. in the British Museum. The editor points out the material we have for the study of Middle English documents, and the methods and peculiar interest of the study; his own treatment of the matter is to be seen in this book. He writes of the Anglo-French elements in the vocabulary and syntax; of the folk-speech elements—strong in the difficult Kentish piece, no. xv; of the family-names and place-names; of the notable persons mentioned, such as Thomas Chaucer, John Fortescue, and William Paston; and his remarks on the punctuation, capital letters, and abbreviations of the texts are interesting and valuable. The notes which accompany each document are full yet concise, and are concerned with palæography, with hard words, with places and persons, and sometimes with vexed questions of phonology, particularly of Anglo-French derivatives. There are indexes of place-names and personal names. I should have liked to see also a list of the more important words, such as Morsbach printed in 1923. A few special points may be mentioned:

No. II, p. 50. *Yenges*: explained as 'ne. *the ings* (an. *eng*)' etc. Is it perhaps *þenges* = *þinges*? For in this text *þ* appears as *y*; and the *i* > *e* in such a position is frequent in Middle English of the fifteenth century, and occasionally earlier.

No. III, p. 65. Here there seems to be an amusing pun—I think the several vowel-sounds were like enough for such a purpose: A man took seisin in the reign of Henry IV, and in 1426 declared that he did so...

'be that tokene that the sayd Wyllyam...sente to the Ale-hows for ale, and ther was noon; and then I seyde, it was the dryest seysyn that ever I was at....'

No. x, p. 75. *Chamber* is here used in the sense 'dowry paid with a bride by her father' or 'some part of the dowry specially devoted to, or consisting of, personal furniture and clothing': cf. Morsbach's 1923 volume, p. 48 (No. xxv); and *Paston Letters* (1900), III, 172, no. 785, Feb. 1477: Tho. Kela to John Paston: 'Ye knowe what my maister and my lady hath profered with hyr .cc. merke. And I dar say that hyr Chamber and areyment schall be worthe .c. merk.'

This is the meaning of *Camera* in the second passage in Du Cange (1842), s.v. *Camera* 8, quoted from the will of James I of Aragon (†1276) and referring to the marriage of his daughter Yolant to Alfonso X of Castile (1252-84): 'Filiam nostram Dominam Yolant Dei gratia illustrem Reginam Castellæ, instituimus hæredem in Camera et ornamentis ac aliis, quæ eidem dedimus suarum tempore nuptiarum.'

The first passage in Du Cange, i.e., from the marriage contract between Yoland daughter of John I (1350-95) of Aragon, and Louis II of Naples (1377-1417), is ambiguous without its context, and might refer to a gift to the bride by the husband, or the property settled upon her after his death.

The French passages quoted by La Curne de Ste. Palaye (1877), III, 341, s.v. *Chambre*, and p. 344, s.v. *Chambree*, refer to the husband's gift, or a gift by a party to a marriage contract to another party.

No. XIII, p. 92. *For* '(†14.3.1134)' read '(†14.3.1434).'

No. XIV, p. 99. The same reference holds good for the 1900 ed. of the *Paston Letters*.

Page 110. *For* 'Meiten' read 'Meilen.'

I may here say that the Coton of No. XXI in Morsbach's *Me. Originalurk. von der Chaucer-Zeit*, etc. is probably *not* Cotton in Alton parish, N. Staffs., but rather Coton Hayes, hamlet in Milwich, six miles east of Stone, Staffs.—or possibly Coton or Coton Clanford, hamlets near Stafford. Cp. Duignan's *Notes on Staffs. Place-Names* (1902), p. 45; and Bartholomew's *Gazetteer of the British Isles* (1914).

CYRIL BRETT.

CARDIFF.

Le Roman de Tristan et Iseut dans l'Œuvre de Thomas Malory. Par EUGÈNE VINAVER. Paris: É. Champion. 1925. 244 pp. 35 fr.

Dr Vinaver, who has already published a volume of *Études sur le Tristan en Prose*, now follows it up with an attempt to define the precise relation to the 'Frensshe Booke' of the Tristram section which occupies Books VIII to XII of Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*. Here he is taking up a task left incomplete by the concurrent investigations of Dr Sommer and M. Löseth in 1890. Dr Sommer, indeed, working only from British Museum MSS., was unable to determine any source for Malory among the forty-six known manuscripts of the French *Tristan*. M. Löseth, on

the other hand, noted agreements between the earlier part of Malory's version and MS. 103 in the Bibliothèque Nationale and between the later part and MS. 99 in the same collection. Starting from this point, Dr Vinaver has discovered that there are also agreements with B.N. 334. All three manuscripts belong to the group which represents the thirteenth-century *Tristan* as rehandled and combined with elements from the *Lancelot* cycle during the fourteenth. By a careful analysis of episodes and proper names, Dr Vinaver has established that the concordances with Malory pass from MS. 103 to MS. 334, and from that to MS. 99, and that there is no overlapping, such as might suggest that all three were being concurrently drawn upon. He concludes that no one of them lay directly before Malory, but that his source was probably a single manuscript from which each of them was in part derived, and which can be substantially reconstructed by linking together in a continuous text the three sections, one from each, which the *Morte d'Arthur* follows. From his orderly and lucid exposition of this scientific problem, Dr Vinaver turns to a more literary theme. What personal equation is disclosed by the English writer's handling of the material, the nature of which can now be fairly estimated, at his disposal? The details of the divergences are set out in a long appendix. Three propositions emerge. In the first place, here as elsewhere, Malory is a drastic abridger. By eliminating episodes and cutting out or amalgamating minor personages, he reduces his original to a sixth of its length. Secondly, although the story remains external and episodic enough, he shows a distinct tendency to stress the psychological element, exalting the heroic character of Lancelot on the one hand, and on the other carrying further the depreciation of Gawain, which the French prose romancers had begun. And thirdly his temper is chivalric, so that he makes a natural and independent reversion to the tone of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, and minimises the critical and even burlesque treatment of knighthood and *amour courtois*, which the sophisticators of the fourteenth century had introduced. This had largely found expression in the personality of Sir Dinadan, and it is characteristic of Malory that he replaces a long passage of Sir Dinadan's japings against love by the single sentence, 'And then Sir Tristram told la Beal Isoude how Sir Dinadan held against all lovers.' M. Vinaver and other French scholars are gradually clearing tracks in this tangled forest of the Arthurian prose romances.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

OXFORD.

A Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions (1578). Edited by HYDER E. ROLLINS. Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1926. 21s.

This handsome volume contains a page-for-page and line-for-line reprint of the Bodleian copy (Malone 464 *a*) of this book, the fifth (so far as may reasonably be guessed) of the Elizabethan miscellanies of verse. The exactitude of the reprinting of the text is qualified not only by certain editorial rectifications sanctioned by custom, such as the

correction of obvious typographical errors, but also by the rendering of the black-letter of the original in roman, of the roman of the original in italic, and of the italic of the original in black-letter, *except* in the title-page, headlines, titles of poems, 'finises' and signatures. The actual printing is as good as one expects to-day from the Harvard University Press; but it is difficult to see that such complex transliteration is worth while.

Mr Rollins' editing omits nothing that his and others' painstaking scholarship has enabled him to collect, but it includes a considerable proportion of what must be regarded as otiose annotation. He alludes in his Introduction to the 'surprisingly numerous proverbs and wise saws' that occur in the *Gorgeous Gallery*, and so much an editor is entitled, even called upon, to observe; but after doing so, to note half-a-dozen occurrences elsewhere of a phrase like 'a birde in hand' is to burden the notes with useless matter. While a certain degree of justification may be pleaded for adducing a number of parallels, contemporary or earlier, to a commonplace like 'stormes faire calmes have brought,' there appears to be no value in such comments as:

'After sharp showres, the sunne shyneth] Cf. Charles Kingsley, *Dolcino to Margaret*:

The world goes up, and the world goes down,
And the sunshine follows the rain';

or:

'On tops of trees] W. S. Gilbert has a song ("The First Lord's Song") in which this expression occurs:

Now, landsmen all, whoever you may be,
If you want to rise to the top of the tree.'

Perhaps Mr Rollins felt the need to alleviate the tedium of his task by such allusions to lighter literature. 'The *Gorgeous Gallery* never won genuine popularity,' he remarks; and 'in modern times it has seldom been read'... 'so far as the general public is concerned the *Gorgeous Gallery* has never been reprinted at all.' Any one who has laboured through a quarter of its 120 pages, and glanced with diminishing endurance through the rest, will wish to insert the word 'deservedly' in each of those sentences. The arguments for reprinting dull matter are, like those for the study of Latin, 'perfectly sound, but difficult to remember.'

F. SIDGWICK.

LONDON.

A Chapter in the Early Life of Shakespeare: Polesworth in Arden. By ARTHUR GRAY. Cambridge University Press. 1926. 123 pp. 7s. 6d.

The pleasant and unassuming way in which the Master of Jesus writes may perhaps blind some readers to the fundamental wantonness of his imagination. He begins by a plea 'for common sense, for some evidence of fact and for the elimination of doubtfully "doubtless" guesswork'; and indeed he does avoid the word 'doubtless' in setting out his guesses,

preferring such periphrases as 'I not doubtfully conclude' (p. 56) and 'I make no question' (p. 29). Actually, the whole substance of the book consists of an attempt to rearrange the recorded facts of Shakespeare's life to fit the conditions of a peculiarly baseless conjecture. Like some others, Mr Gray finds it difficult to realise how the Stratford glover's son can have come to know and feel all that the author of the plays obviously did know and feel. Somewhere, he thinks, and certainly not at Stratford, William must have received the education of a scholar and a gentleman. He plays with the notion of residence at a University, but finally decides for a boyhood spent as a page in the service of some family of distinction. Such was the boyhood of Shakespeare's friend Drayton with Sir Henry Goodere of Polesworth. And lo! it is pointed out to Mr Gray that on 3 January 1571 Sir Henry Goodere, with Sir Fulke Greville, Sir Thomas Lucy and Mr Clement Throckmorton, came riding into Stratford, to arbitrate in a dispute between the corporation and a leading citizen, and was entertained by the corporation at the Bear Inn in Bridge Street. This gives him a clue. Obviously this visit was the chance of Shakespeare's life, and his father the Alderman was not slow to take it.

What talk may have passed between him and Goodere it is impossible to say. But I take it that, then or later, little William was packed off to Polesworth—a curious piece of good luck for him and for us: for in all England, outside London, there was then, and was to be later, no place more feracious of poetic genius than Polesworth Hall.

That is all there is to it; but no doubt much of what passes for literary history has been woven together by mental processes of equal simplicity. Mr Gray has searched into the biographies of Sir Henry Goodere and his nephew and successor, a second Sir Henry. But he has found practically nothing here to buttress his hypothesis. There was probably some tie of family association with the Earl of Southampton. But obviously Southampton must have had a wide circle of acquaintances, and it is idle to suggest that any particular member of it is likely to have brought him into touch with Shakespeare. The younger Goodere moved, with Ben Jonson and Donne, in the literary society dominated by Lucy, Countess of Bedford. There are many records of that society, but they yield no traces of Shakespeare. Perhaps he drank with Drayton shortly before his death. They had written for the stage during the same period, and Drayton was in the habit of visiting Anne Goodere in the house of her husband Sir Henry Rainsford at Clifford Chambers (which Mr Gray rather persistently calls Clifton Chambers) near Stratford. It would be absurd to suppose that the friendship between the two poets bears evidence to a distant pageship together in Polesworth. Then there is the question of schooling. Mr Gray thinks that, when the Gooderes acquired the Polesworth nunnery buildings at the Dissolution, they continued a school held there by the nuns, and he even points to an upper chamber in the still extant gatehouse which he thinks looks like a schoolroom. It is not much proof of this that the school for poor boys and girls endowed at Polesworth in 1655 by Sir Francis Nethersole, who

had married a Goodere heiress, was already in existence when the trust deed was drawn. It was certainly of very different character from the nunnery school, which is clearly shown by a document from which Mr Gray quotes to have been a boarding school for gentlemen's daughters from a distance. There is no proof and very little probability that the nuns had a grammar school or a school for boys at all; and if so, Mr Gray's theory that the Gooderes would have continued it falls to the ground. And if there was a grammar school, why should it be supposed to have given a better education than that at Stratford, which secured University teachers and paid them well? 'Nevertheless,' says Mr Gray, 'the masters made haste to exchange their posts for better ones.' Perhaps Mr Gray is not so familiar as some of us with the uneasiness of teachers, even in well-found schools, under municipal control. He does not, by the way, seem to have enquired whether there are any episcopal licences for teachers at Polesworth. I am afraid that his book stands or falls with his inference from the arbitration at Stratford in 1571. I may add that, guess for guess, I should have put my money, not on Sir Henry Goodere, but upon Sir Fulke Greville of Beauchamp's Court near Alcester, since he was the father of the first Lord Brooke, and there is a curious and hitherto unexplained bit of gossip which makes Lord Brooke boast of it as a feather in his cap that he was once 'master' to Shakespeare.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

OXFORD.

Falstaff and other Shakespearean Topics. By ALBERT H. TOLMAN. New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan. 1925. xii + 270 pp. 10s. 6d.

In this volume the author has brought together and supplemented his contributions to various literary publications on a number of topics interesting to students of Shakespeare. Much the longest is a useful summary of 'The Early History of Shakespeare's Reputation,' an address delivered in 1920. Whatever his topic, Mr Tolman may be depended on to treat the matter fairly, and generally with good sense. If he records the questionable ingenuities of others, it is gently to discourage them. He is perhaps not so successful when now and then he questions Shakespeare's own wisdom or skill. So, in *Coriolanus*, the supposed fact that the interposition of Menenius with his fable 'is not made causative in any way, superexcellent as it is in itself,' and is therefore 'good for nothing,' is blamed as 'an artistic mistake, an unfortunate alteration of the story of Plutarch.' But the intervention of Menenius *is* causative in the play, since it keeps a formidable body of mutineers out of mischief at a critical moment, not to speak of 'almost thoroughly' persuading them; and one is rather inclined to admire the skill which made prominent use of this incident instead of the more difficult situation reported by Marcius, which would have anticipated later situations of a similar kind.

Nothing could be fairer than Mr Tolman's defence of Shakespeare

against charges of hatred of the common people based on biased and incomplete study of his work, and he does him justice in his 'Conclusion' (p. 43). None the less, Shakespeare is not quite forgiven for his conservative habit of mind—for not being a democrat, even in the sixteenth or early seventeenth century. The utterances of Ulysses in *Troilus and Cressida* on 'degree' (which would seem to be a thing unknown to democracy) are accepted as Shakespeare's own, and as *Troilus and Cressida* is 'an unpleasant play,' 'It seems to have been when the poet's mind was least wholesome that it was most aristocratic'!

In the essay which opens the book and gives its title, Mr Tolman attempts to show that the fascinating character of Falstaff in *Henry IV* is 'a structural necessity' of the plays, not as part of a comic underplot contrived to aid the effective handling of a reign which is not as a whole dramatic, but as a means of palliating and almost justifying Prince Hal's intimacy with the knight, of reconciling the hero-king with the earlier boon companion, of making 'the seemingly impossible possible, even natural.' Space does not permit me to do justice to his argument, or to oppose it further than by a doubt whether this reconciliation is needed. Prodigals are not unpopular, and repentant ones, fortunately not unknown, are generally too welcome to need explanation.

R. H. CASE.

LIVERPOOL.

The Plague Pamphlets of Thomas Dekker. Edited by F. P. WILSON. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1925. xl + 268 pp. 9s.

Dekker's prose works have been hard to come at, and we may well rejoice that they are now being gradually presented to us by so good a scholar and bibliographer as Mr F. P. Wilson, and in the beautiful print of the Clarendon Press. In the present volume Mr Wilson has carefully reproduced the original editions of three tracts provoked by the plague of 1603—(1) *The Wonderfull Yeare*, (2) *Newes from Graves-end* and (3) *The Meeting of Gallants*; one provoked by that of 1625, (4) *A Rod for Run-awayes*; and two by the milder epidemic of 1630, (5) *London Looke Backe*, and (6) *The Blacke Rod and the White Rod*. Of these (1) and (4) were published with Dekker's name, (2) was assigned to him by J. P. Collier, the other three are now assigned to him for the first time. About (3) Mr Wilson is in some doubt, as while it has strong affinities with Dekker's work, it is also closely related to two pamphlets issued in the same year by 'T. M.' (probably T. Middleton). He leaves us with the conclusion 'that if *The Meeting of Gallants* is not Dekker's, it is T. M.'s, if indeed it is not, like *The Honest Whore*, a work of collaboration.' But in all these ascriptions Mr Wilson gives such good grounds for his opinions, that one cannot hastily question their soundness.

It is needless to say that in these tracts we get a lively picture, heightened by gruesome stories, of the London of Dekker's day under the terrible visitation of plague—needless also to say that on every page we are regaled with strong vernacular English, which only comes a little

short of the more brilliant and more humorous audacities of Nashe. Many phrases here have not been found elsewhere so early, or not at all, so that it was a good thought of Mr Wilson's to give us a list of the more interesting as an appendix to the notes in which he brings his wide knowledge of the history and literature of the period to explain difficulties in the subject-matter.

There are indeed so many points and so many phrases to annotate that it is not surprising that some expressions on which we should have welcomed a note are left without remark. Even if the expression is explained in the *New English Dictionary*, that work is not at everybody's elbow.

P. 10, l. 3. The note on 'gilded rosemary' is not quite adequate. Cp. Herrick, *Hesp.* 618, *To the Maids*:

we'll draw lots who shall buy
And gild the bays and rosemary.

P. 13. Is anything known of the previous presentation to the King of the poem on the state of England at the death of Elizabeth?

P. 16. I think the words 'bowles: such as do breed in feasts' means more than 'The bowls "breed in feasts" by simple division.' The following line, 'For warre and death cupboords of plate down pulls' points to the meaning that silver plate is bred, or multiplied, in years of peace and festivity.

P. 19. What does Dekker mean by saying of Plato's year, 'whither it be past alreadie or to come within these foure yeares'?

P. 20, bot. The image of James as a sun dispersing the clouds was to be used by the Bible Translators of 1611.

P. 22, l. 2. 'ere since' = I suppose, 'e'er since.'

P. 22, l. 13. The *N.E.D.* throws no light on the description of James as 'the Meeter of our dayes.' Is 'regulator,' 'harmonizer,' meant?

P. 37, l. 19. What is the meaning of 'band for the heavens'? 'banned against entering heaven, i.e. consigned to another place'?

P. 40, l. 16. 'the seauen electors' need a note.

P. 42, l. 1. Are not 'drawing windowes' more likely 'windows that open and are drawn in' than 'windows that draw in the air'?

P. 68, l. 19. I think Dekker only means: 'most (or all) of your liberal sciences would have merely been applied to base uses.'

P. 92, l. 4. 'leatherne hinde' is an interesting parallel to 'leathern Adam' in *Edward III*, II, ii, 117, called by the *N.E.D.* a 'nonce-use.'

P. 94, l. 20. 'Men should be deaffe, as those that dwell

By *Nylus* fall.'

A more apposite illustration than that from Pliny is Cic. *de Repub.* VI, 18: 'ubi Nilus ad illa quæ Catadupa nominantur præcipitat ex altissimis montibus, ea gens quæ illum locum accolit propter magnitudinem sonitus sensu audiendi caret.'

P. 97, l. 26. Is 'breath' a misprint for 'beareth'?

P. 110, l. 17. 'their golden Hills' is a reminiscence of 'montes auri,' Ter. *Phorm.* I, ii, 18.

P. 117, l. 11. Is there a reminiscence of Shakespeare's 'harmless necessary cat' (*M. of V.* iv, i, 55) in 'a harmelesse necessary Coverlid'?

P. 120, l. 24. Does 'was I with you?' mean 'have I caught you?'?

P. 121, l. 3. 'my Gallant Bullyes of fve and twenty' and p. 130, l. 15: 'Gentlemen-Gallants of fve and twentie.' This is left unexplained. It is, I think, to be compared with *Twelfth Night*, III, ii, 71: 'the youngest wren of nine'; Dekker, *Honest Whore*, II, i: 'is it you, sir? the worst of twenty'; *Hycke Scorne*: 'Nay that is the least thought that they have of fyftene'; Medwall, *Fulgens and Lucres*, I, 1183: 'the last care of XV,' etc. Each of the men would be picked out of 25 as a gallant.

P. 131, l. 1. Is this 'Tinker of Banburie' a Puritan at his prayers?

A note would have been welcome on a few more uncommon uses of words. But it is ungracious, especially in these days of costly printing, to ask for more when so ample a feast is provided. Mr Wilson has done his work admirably and we can wish for nothing better than to read the rest of Dekker's prose works with all those helps to our enjoyment that the editor's wide learning and exact scholarship have provided for us in the *Plague Pamphlets*.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

PAUL DOTTIN. *Daniel Defoe et ses Romans*. Tomes I-III. Paris: Les Presses universitaires; London: H. Milford. 1924. xii + 896 pp. Each 7s. 6d.

The varied, erratic and not too creditable career of Defoe is obscure, as indeed that worthy intended it to be. Consequently he has become one of the recognised fields in which new comers to the world of academic literature can distinguish themselves. Perhaps that is the reason why Dr P. Dottin has embarked on this thorough-going study of the adventurer's life and labours. The critic has certainly spared himself no pains. He has set himself to examine or re-examine all available documents, but even at the end of what undoubtedly proves to be an exhaustive research, he has found only too many gaps still unfilled. Defoe's vagaries among the welter of religions and politics, his ventures in journalism and commerce, his many expeditions about England, Scotland, and France—these projects and aberrations were too complicated and manifold to be traced by means of biographical data. Under these circumstances Dr Dottin has adopted the only possible way; he has endeavoured to catch and hold this elusive being, as reflected in his imaginative works. He holds the theory which Guy de Maupassant put forward in his preface to *Pierre et Jean* that no writer of the psychological novel can put anything but his own thoughts into the characters which he creates. So he works through his stories looking in every nook and corner for the real Defoe; he elucidates the man by the books and the books by the man. He has indeed brought to light some fresh documents relative to his author's political career, but on the whole this study is most interesting as a reinterpretation of Defoe's literary output.

This adventurer into business, politics and literature stands before us as a man of moral weakness and tenacious energy. Dr Dottin pictures him first as a youth full of noble aspirations in his puritan home, but soon corrupted by the unscrupulous ambitions of his age. Then we see him with worldly success almost within his grasp. He falls to the depths, but not like Lucifer, for as prosperity leaves him he rises again as a man of letters, a student of human nature and a singularly acute observer of his age.

On the whole, one feels that Dr Dottin is at his best when discussing the literary aspects of these works; *Robinson Crusoe's* place in English literature, its influence in France and Germany, its relation to the modern novel; or the evolution of the historical novel as exemplified by *The Memoirs of a Cavalier*; or the characteristics of *The Plague Year* and *Moll Flanders*. If this extremely useful 'étude' at times falls short of our expectations, it is when the author endeavours to visualise in one composite picture how thousands of minds were working two hundred years ago. Taine first showed Frenchmen how to reconstruct an age from the few scattered documents which can still be interpreted. But Taine had a prodigiously sympathetic imagination and a surprising insight into the moods of men. Moreover he seldom allowed his speculations to wander beyond the limitations of his data. That is to say, he pictured past generations only in relation to their arts which have survived. But art, especially literature, fills but a very small part of a man's life, then as now. Our actions and even our aspirations are, for the most part, to be traced to very different sources, which do not survive. In fact the individuals seem to be at the mercy of impulses and accidents, while the age itself is quite unconscious of the forces which mould its destinies. Stories and even essays do not always supply the required clues. It is when trying to crystallise this confused welter that the historian is apt to be unconvincing, especially the literary historian who exaggerates the influence of books.

H. V. ROUTH.

LONDON.

Geschichte der französischen Literatur. Von VICTOR KLEMPERER. Band v. Erster Teil. *Die Romantik.* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1925. 288 pp. 10 M.

Professor Klemperer has his own way of writing the history of literature. He will have none of your literary lexicons, loose catalogues of mere events, of names and dates and places. Either you read his book from cover to cover, or else you leave it alone. This is distinctly not the sort of history of literature that you look up in a hurry in order to find out when Victor Hugo died or on what particular evening in the nineteenth century young Gautier wore the historic waistcoat. Nor is it the sort of history of literature that leads the mind to strange places and leaves it there to discover its own strength or helplessness. From the very outset, the author takes his reader firmly by the hand and he does not let go until he has fairly finished with him.

This, then, is a book of opinions: and those who are familiar with the previous volumes of this interesting history will know that these opinions are well worthy of attention. Profane readers may perhaps find Klemperer a trifle too intellectual. They may at times be aware of a certain faintness and wish that they were more frequently reminded that literature is a pleasurable thing, made by all sorts of queer people, even habitually irresponsible people, the next best thing, with the kindred arts, to life itself. We in England do not readily relinquish our amateur status, either towards life or literature. But there is another point of view. The historian of literature, like a general reviewing his army, sees his men in columns and the columns in movement from point to point. Thus it is in the present volume. We see the unconscious strategy of books, the 'Strömungen' that sweep them away towards the future that is our present.

The so-called Romantic movement is not exhausted: far from it. But it has already passed through a series of phases; and it is with these that Klemperer is particularly concerned. We confess, for our own part, that we were puzzled to find no less a person than Napoleon at the prow of the Romantic 'galère.' And, for all the author's special pleading, we are inclined to advise the reader who prefers the real beginning of a book to its ostensible one, to tackle first the chapter styled 'Die Eigenart der französischen Romantik': and to note with particular care the sentences:

Gelangt man einmal dazu, in den mannigfachen Erscheinungsformen des Romanischen einen einheitlichen seelischen Typus zu finden, den des grenzenlos Sehnsüchtigen, des Ruhelosen, so hat man im gleichen Augenblick festgestellt, dass es sich hier um eine germanische oder nordische oder vielleicht auch um eine rein deutsche Sache handelt. Und dass der Romane und nun gar der Franzose im tiefsten ihr fremd und feindlich oder doch angstvoll gegenüber stehen muss (p. 100).

That is not so much the starting-point as the circumference of Klemperer's thought on French Romanticism. Granted this much, he undertakes to show us the fluctuations of this imperfect type (p. 101), the tentative approaches towards it, its establishment, the partial revolt against it and its quite recent triumphs.

The Paris critics may not much like Klemperer's premises. They will find the 'unvollkommene Romantik' notion hard to swallow, more particularly if they have forgotten their *De l'Allemagne*. But we cannot discuss here either Klemperer's general conception of Romanticism, or the inverted classicism which he takes to be the French brand. For such a pretty fight we should require more elbow-room than we are likely to be accorded here; and moreover we are not quite sure whether we should fight with the author or against him. In matters of critical detail, at any rate, Klemperer is sufficiently conservative. We could wish that his sense of the importance of ideas had not led him to trample quite so ruthlessly on chronology. It comes as a shock to tame scholars to hear about Victor Hugo before Lamartine. And we do think that the author cannot possibly be right in attributing to Chateaubriand no religious conscience or influence at all: that statement will make our

young neo-catholics of to-day tremble for their own fate in literary posterity. Now that M. Giraud's first volume on Chateaubriand's Christianity is available, perhaps Klemperer himself will be inclined to revise it. But these are small matters in comparison with the general excellence of the book. We trust it will be read in England and in France, as well as in Germany.

D. G. LARG.

SHEFFIELD.

DAVID GLASS LARG. *Madame de Staël. La Vie dans l'Œuvre* (1766–1800). *Essai de Biographie morale et intellectuelle*. Paris: Édouard Champion. 1924. viii + 227 pp. 15 fr.

'Il y a deux manières de retrouver Mme de Staël,' writes Mr Larg in his Preface; 'dans l'histoire de son époque, dans l'œuvre qu'elle nous a laissée.' The first method, that of historical research, has been much applied and with a talent and learning that might discourage future exploration. Mr Larg has had the simple but quite original idea of seeking Madame de Staël in her works. And lest the word simple be misinterpreted, I hasten to add that the discovery was simple only as most discoveries appear simple when they have been made.

Who reads the works of Madame de Staël to-day? Who to-day knows even by name *Pauline*, *Mirza* and *Adélaïde* or has heard of *Sophie ou les Sentiments secrets*? Skipping nothing by the way, Mr Larg has traversed the whole path of Madame de Staël's literary career, methodically, diligently, from *Les Inconvénients de la Vie de Paris*, an edifying play which Germaine composed at the age of twelve, down to *De la Littérature*, published in April 1800.

Mr Larg has no illusions as to the literary value of these productions; he accepts as well-merited and inevitable the indifference of later generations towards works which were never works of art, whatever their other qualities. Nor is he very much interested in Madame de Staël's ideas as such, and indeed it would be a thankless task, at the present date, to discover Madame de Staël as a thinker. What could survive has survived, been absorbed and popularised, and the rest is well dead.

What, one may ask, remains of Madame de Staël, since oblivion has been the fate of her writings? There remains her personality and though Mr Larg does not take us into his confidence as to the genesis of his work, I presume it was her personality which first attracted him, appealed to his curiosity or imagination and made him wish to know her better.

Mr Larg disowns any attempt at erudite research, but, in spite of himself, he makes his own contribution to it. See, for instance, his discussion, based on moral considerations, of the date at which certain works were written or published, notably the *Lettres sur Jean-Jacques Rousseau*. But such discoveries occur by the way. Mr Larg's main business is to investigate the works of Madame de Staël by the light of her character or—and it comes to the same thing—to investigate the character of Madame de Staël by the light of her works. The result of

his labours is a very subtle psychological interpretation of her writings, or—if you look at it the other way round—a minutely-drawn and authentic portrait of Madame de Staël.

How does she emerge from this scrutiny? She herself thought she had everything to gain by just such an examination. Mr Larg quotes, 'Condamnée à la célébrité, sans pouvoir être connue, j'éprouve le besoin de me faire juger par mes écrits. Calomniée sans cesse, et me trouvant trop peu d'importance pour me résoudre à parler de moi, j'ai dû céder à l'espoir qu'en publiant ce fruit de mes méditations, je donnerais quelque idée vraie des habitudes de ma vie et de la nature de mon caractère.' And yet after 227 pages devoted to the dissection of 'la nature de son caractère,' she appears to us much the same woman as before—the same only more so, exuberant, impulsive, obvious, generous to her enemies as to her friends, and alas! so tactless.

The book opens with the well-known remark of Madame Necker de Saussure: 'Il semble que Madame de Staël ait toujours été jeune et n'ait jamais été enfant.' She presents indeed the extraordinary spectacle of a character that never evolved. It is not that there was no break or deviation in her growth but rather that there was no growth. From the earliest portraits we have of her, and some go back to the age of twelve, she is complete, with the mental and moral equipment she will carry through life.

This view of Madame de Staël's character has long been the general one. Mr Larg now proves it is the right one, in the chapters where he analyses her early writings, those preceding her marriage in 1786 (she was born in 1766) or immediately following it.

After her marriage, Madame de Staël makes her official entrance into society, and a short but excellent chapter describes *Mme de Staël à Versailles et à Paris*. It was easy to make fun of her as of any woman who, plain of feature and clumsy of gesture, still expects to cut a conspicuous figure, and the ladies of the court of Marie-Antoinette gave themselves the pleasure in full. Mr Larg holds the balance nicely between Versailles and Geneva.

The early works of Madame de Staël had been imaginative, plays and short stories, a vein which she abandoned almost completely to return to it, sensationally, with *Delphine* and *Corinne*. Mr Larg examines in turn, placing them in the framework of her life, the *Lettres sur Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, the *Réflexions sur le Procès de la Reine*, *De l'Influence des Passions* (note here some curious pages on *l'Essai sur les Fictions*), the *Réflexions sur la Paix* and *De la Littérature*.

The subject varies. The motives for writing remain always the same—a desire for fame and a wish to escape from herself, from certain feelings which obsess her, from the horrors of revolutionary France or from the desert of her own sentimental life. The attitude also, the method of approach towards her subject, remains identical, and Mr Larg clearly shows that what is left, in each of these works, at the last analysis is the personality of Madame de Staël. 'L'on voit très clairement dans les *Lettres sur J.-J. Rousseau* ce qu'est Mme de Staël en 1788, ce qu'elle

sent, ce qu'elle pense, et même ce qu'elle pourra, selon toutes les probabilités humaines, devenir.' And, after exposing the theories set out in *De la Littérature*, a book where one might expect to find the impersonal note dominant: 'La doctrine littéraire qui se dégage de *De la Littérature* s'appelle Mme de Staël.'

Mr Larg closes his book with the year 1800, at which date he considers Madame de Staël had arrived at maturity, i.e., self-knowledge. He does not therefore speak to us of *Delphine*, published in 1802, or of *Corinne* (1807) or of *De l'Allemagne*. More important still, he has little to say about Madame de Staël and Napoleon, for the reason that little had as yet taken place. They had met, Mme de Staël had coquetted, then turned refractory, as Bonaparte continued consistently to decline her advances; but though *De la Littérature* contains many veiled attacks on the First Consul, war was not yet declared. At the base of the situation that was to arise between them lay an antagonism of character that it would have been interesting to see Mr Larg dissect.

We hope that the rumour is correct that his intention is to complete his study in a second volume.

DORIS GUNNELL.

LEEDS.

R. MURRIS. *La Hollande et les Hollandais au XVII^e et au XVIII^e Siècles vus par les Français*. Paris: É. Champion. 1925. 295 pp. 30 fr.

J. FRANSEN. *Les Comédiens Français en Hollande au XVII^e et au XVIII^e Siècles*. Paris: É. Champion. 1925. vi + 467 pp. 45 fr.

Both these studies are worthy additions to the *Bibliothèque de Littérature Comparée*, of which they constitute tomes xxiv and xxv respectively. Immense pains have gone to their compilation, they appear in a pleasing form, with exhaustive bibliographies and indexes, they both deal with the same period of time and preponderantly with the Province of Holland proper and are written in impeccable French.

Mijnheer Murriss has skilfully cut up one hundred accounts written in French or by Frenchmen, eliminated many redundancies, and then rearticulated them under eight heads: Impressions Générales; Les Habitants; Mœurs; Langue, Littérature, Théâtre; Peinture, etc.; Sciences; Religion; Gouvernement. As the unavoidable result of this method, the chapters somewhat resemble 'composite photographs' by their characterlessness, which is enhanced by the rigidity with which the compiler holds himself aloof and by the undeniable fact that almost all his 'subjects' were either dull dogs or (like Diderot) a good deal below par when they wrote about Holland and the Dutch. They tell us that a great part of the land lies under high-water mark, that there is much skating in winter—which looks very pretty—that Dutch writers do not compose according to rule, and they hold up astounded hands at cleanliness, religious toleration and a strange humanity which punishes a master for cudgelling his lackeys. The reader soon begins to long for an E. V. Lucas, or E. van

Lucas, as the Index designates him (p. 288), who would tell him something he couldn't guess for himself.

Mijnheer Murris relies solely on printed sources; the greater part of Mijnheer Fransen's copious and mostly novel material derives from documents in the archives of Amsterdam, 's Gravenhage, Maastricht, Haarlem, Leyden, Nieuwer-Amstel, Nijmegen, Utrecht, as well as those of Paris, Bruxelles, Bordeaux and Rouen—many of them consulted for the first time. As the result we have a worthy companion to M. Liebrecht's *Histoire du Théâtre Français à Bruxelles* (Paris, 1923), with which it has several points of contact: externally, in the thirty-three fine plates and the innumerable specimens of players' and managers' signatures; internally, in the circumstance that the fortunes of the French actors at Bruxelles had important repercussions in the Seven Provinces, whither they would often move on, just as, from time to time, Holland served as a jumping-off place for tours to Copenhagen and other cities of the North.

Mijnheer Fransen's interest, here at any rate, has not been literary or *kulturgeschichtlich*; it has concentrated on biography and economics. With infinite patience he has established the personnel of the strolling 'commonwealth' troupes, which held the field in the seventeenth century, and of the equally kaleidoscopic companies gathered by the impresarios, who begin to wax important when G. Schott of Hamburg set up business at 's Gravenhage in 1700; he has discovered where and when they acted, the structural alterations they made to the premises which they leased, the wiles by which they played off the princes of Orange against the puritanical consistories and municipal against provincial authorities in order to obtain a footing at all, the amount of their receipts and taxes, the nature of their repertoires, as well as countless particulars of their private lives, many of them most racy. These facts are of interest not only to Dutch students, but make Mijnheer Fransen's book also of prime importance to any future historian of the theatre or biographer of the French stage: for many established favourites and favourites-to-be of the Paris public figure in his annals.

B. W. DOWNS.

CAMBRIDGE.

Geschichte der lateinischen Liebesdichtung im Mittelalter. Von HENNIG BRINKMANN. Halle: M. Niemeyer. 1925. vi + 110 pp. 5 M. 50.
Entstehungsgeschichte des Minnesangs. Von HENNIG BRINKMANN. Halle: M. Niemeyer. 1926. viii + 172 pp. 7 M. 50.

These two books, with their lucid exposition, their moderate tone and firm handling of evidence, are a very great pleasure to read, apart from their ultimate value. The last is not easy to estimate. *Die Entstehungsgeschichte des Minnesangs*—Herr Brinkmann offers us a carefully weighed solution of that contested problem. In the learned and courtly poetry of Latin tradition, cultivated at the turn of the eleventh and twelfth centuries at Angers, he finds anticipated, not vaguely, but with distinct

affinities, characteristic ideas and modes of the Troubadour lyric. Burdach's theory of Arabian origin is rejected as insufficient, since no historical evidence has been found to bridge over the gap separating the Moorish poetry of the ninth from the Provençal poetry of the twelfth century. In contrast to this, the close political bond uniting Anjou with Poitou and Limousin suggests, without hindrance, an immediate link between the beginnings of Troubadour poetry and the older Latin tradition of the school of Angers. The resemblances are very striking. We find princesses, famous for grace and learning, receiving from their ecclesiastical admirers the same kind of adulation as afterwards from the Troubadours. Influences which in Wechssler's *Kunstproblem des Minnesangs* had been treated as separate forces are seen to have converged already. Thus the ideal of the *amour courtois* as a union of courtly homage with the attributes of refined friendship and mystical fervour may have come direct from the Latin tradition; *Preisgedicht* and *Freundschaftsepistel* are the older literary forms by which these different aspects were called into play. To this sublimated ideal is added, in the Troubadour lyric, the sensuous passion which finds untrammelled outlet in the *Vagantendichtung*. The Provençal singers 'fanden christliche Minne (Angers) und irdische Minne (Vaganten) literarisch kultiviert vor. Keins von beiden war ihre Schöpfung. Ihre Eigenleistung war vielmehr die Verbindung zwei so gegensätzlicher Welten.' The statement is complete rather than true. For the sensuous passion expressed by the Troubadour lyric is one of those direct experiences which need no literary precedent to explain it. It is otherwise with the intellectual subtleties of the *amour courtois*.

On the whole, this attempt to elucidate the earlier history of the Provençal lyric (pp. 1-88 of the *Entstehungsgeschichte des Minnesangs*) seems to mark a certain advance towards truth. I have for that reason considered it first. *Die Geschichte der lateinischen Liebesdichtung im Mittelalter* shows how carefully the way is paved. The character and scope of this work are summed up in the author's *Vorwort* as follows:

Diese Schrift hat doppelten Charakter....Sie sucht die Geschichte mittellateinischer Liebesdichtung aufzuhalten und soll dabei Vorarbeit sein einer grösseren Untersuchung über die Entstehung des Minnesangs. Ich bin ausgegangen von der Absicht, das Problem des Minnesangs von mittellateinischer Seite zu fassen, und da erkannte ich bald, wie wichtig einmal Klarlegung der mittellateinischen Verhältnisse ist, über die sich noch vielfach Nacht und Dunkel breiten. Die Geschichte lateinischer Liebesdichtung im Mittelalter oder doch wenigstens ein Versuch dazu war zu schreiben. So hat die Vorarbeit eignes Leben gewonnen und sich zu selbständiger Bedeutung ausgewachsen.

The cultural background is briefly and incisively sketched; then follows, at more leisure, an account of the evolution of the Latin love-lyric, treated *in extenso* from the ninth century to the twelfth. Two opposite lines of tradition are distinguished. The ideal, fostered within the Church, of a chaste and fellowly amity between men and women, based on sympathies of the mind and soul, is seen growing and gathering strength until, in the classic example of Abelard and Heloise, though

not here alone, it oversteps its limits. Parallel with this, a revival of Pagan hedonistic culture, springing up in the decadent and licentious Italy of the tenth century, spreads its branches further, and blossoms finally into the superb lawlessness of *Vagantentum*. Such is the main idea. The book is perhaps rather loosely composed, its character is fragmentary and experimental, as the author himself confesses; nevertheless, it gives a fresh and interesting survey of a little-known field.

There is one cardinal failing: a rooted tendency to deny the influence, almost, sometimes, the existence, of any lost ground of vernacular poetry. The author goes much too far in his reaction against the 'romantische Schwärmerei' of an earlier school, and in so doing falls into the opposite error of undue scepticism. Passing on to consider the origins of the German Minnesang (*Entstehungsgesch. des Minnesangs*, pp. 89-162), he applies his theory of Latin influence to its oldest and most primitive phase. With this result:

Der deutsche Minnesang nimmt seinen Ausgang von lateinischen Briefen und Versen rhythmischer Form. Schon in den Anfängen finden wir Dichterpersönlichkeiten wie Meinloh, Kürenberg, Dietmar, die Überkommenes ihrer starken Eigenart anpassen. Dietmar führt neuen Stoff und neue Formkünste zu, die er seiner Bekanntschaft mit Vagantenliedern verdankt. Bis hierher kommt allein mittel-lateinische Poesie metrischer, dann rhythmischer Art, als Einflussquelle in Frage. Von Hausen ab ist zugleich mit Einwirkung romanischer Dichtung für den folgenden Zeitraum zu rechnen.

Certainly, the theory is well provided with facts, but they speak to us without persuasion. The author's method becomes, in this part of his subject, strained and biased. His Latin parallels are unconvincing: the ideas expressed are so simple, their associations so unforced and natural, that there seems no reason why they should not have been uttered independently twice over. Most of all, the theory is disproved by the tone and style of the earlier Minnelieder, first, by the absence of any learned element, then, also, by their limpid diction and felicitous brevity, unthinkable, one must assume, without some measure of traditional art.

Both books have recently been reviewed in the *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* by J. Schwietering, who subjects them to over twelve pages of destructive criticism. How far this severity is justified, a mere outsider cannot presume to say; but, at least, the charge of overconfidence and of one-sided statement is quite misleading. In reality, Brinkmann approaches his subject with a degree of modesty and discretion for which it is unfair to deny him credit. It may not be superfluous to inquire whether the reviewer himself, in his attitude to the problems of medieval literature, entirely escapes the charge of harping upon one particular string.

M. F. RICHEY.

ENGLEFIELD GREEN, SURREY.

Tristan und Isold. Von FRIEDRICH RANKE. (*Bücher des Mittelalters*, herausgegeben von F. von der Leyen, III.) Munich: F. Bruckmann. 1925. 283 pp. 8 M. 50.

In accordance with the plan of the series in which this work appears,

Ranke covers a narrower field than his predecessor, W. Golther, who, in his *Tristan und Isolde*, Leipzig, 1907, traced the literary history of the *Tristan* theme down to modern times; Ranke takes us only as far as the sixteenth century. He deals with what he considers the earliest Celtic *Tristan* poetry, the oldest *Tristan* epic which introduced the great *novum*, the love-potion, and its continuation, i.e., the *estoire*—all these by way of reconstruction. Then follow the first extant version, the somewhat crude but vigorous German epic of the Brunswick knight Eilhard von Oberge (c. 1175), and—likewise dependent on the *estoire*—that of the Anglo-Norman Beroul. Episodic *Tristan* poems, the *lai du Chievrefoil* of Marie de France, the nightingale lay in *le donnoi des amants* and *la Folie Tristan* follow. Greater space (pp. 126–232) is naturally devoted to the works of Thomas and Gotfried von Strassburg; and the final chapter gives a survey of the saga in the late Middle Ages: the prose versions in French and German (the latter, by an anonymous author, based on Eilhart's poem), the continuation of Gotfried's unfinished work by Ulrich von Türheim and, more sympathetically, by Heinrich von Freiberg; Hans Sachs' Meistergesänge and *tragedia von der strengen Lieb Herr Tristant*, and finally, a return to true poetry, the Icelandic *Tristramskvaedi* of not later than the fifteenth century. Of this Ranke gives side by side with the original a pleasing adaptation in the original metre. The Old French and Middle High German extracts are also accompanied by close and reliable translations.

As was only to be expected from a scholar who has already given proofs of his intimate study of Gotfried von Strassburg, and who will, it is to be hoped, soon, give us the first critical edition of Gotfried's epic, he is at his best in dealing with that poet. With loving care he arrays the manifold traces which show the originality of the great Strassburg poet in spite of his otherwise close dependence on his source. He shows us a soul fired and consumed by the *one* thought -*minne*, serving at the shrine of the goddess Minne whose temple, the Minnegrotte, the poet describes and expounds in allegorical terms taken from the mediæval symbolisation of the Christian Church (cf. pp. 206–9).

Ranke makes the bold attempt of reconstructing the oldest Celtic *Tristan* poetry as Celtic *fabulatores* may have told it in or about the eleventh century, in prose presumably interwoven with lyrical strophes (pp. 3–7). Therein he sees the source of the oldest (lost) *Tristan* epic of the first half of the twelfth century, whose home and author's nationality remain undetermined (pp. 8–21). Ranke is building on ground cautiously prepared by G. Schoepperle in her *Tristan* studies (Frankfurt, 1913). This groundwork, i.e., the many analogies to Celtic tradition in the extant *Tristan* romances, will stand, but we have no evidence as Ranke assumes, that such Celtic tales, especially the *aisthed* of Diarmaid and Grainne, were associated with the name of Tristan before they passed into the hands of a French redactor. The reconstructed Celtic *Tristan* poetry remains therefore a mere hypothesis and to my mind a very improbable one.

R. PRIEBSCH.

LONDON.

M. L. R. XXII

8

The Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales being the Older Form of British Romani preserved in the speech of the clan of Abram Wood. By JOHN SAMPSON. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1926. xxiii + 230, 419 pp. 4 guineas.

In this mighty work Dr Sampson sets the seal on his life-long devotion to Gypsy studies. Our admiration is tinged with awe at the immense labour and unceasing care involved in bringing together and presenting in scientific fashion these myriads of genuine Gypsy utterances. His discovery in 1894 that 'deep Gypsy' was still spoken by a harper of Bala, great-grandson of a seventeenth-century Abram Wood the founder of the clan whose dialect is here treated, may have been a re-discovery; none the less the Vinland of Crofton and Groome has become the America of Dr Sampson. We share his thrill at finding so near us a language still essentially Indian, oriental in its retention of aspirated stops, various front spirants and a mobile accent and endowed with a rich flexional system to rejoice the heart of a Schleicher.

The sounds are described in the manner of Sweet and transcribed practically and agreeably. Among the consonants *f* (so strangely absent from primitive Indo-European and Finno-Ugrian), *β*, *w* and *ϝ* are unmasked as intruders. The Indian speech-basis has suffered little fundamental modification; some changes are paralleled in the Prākritis. In word-building the language has reared a superstructure on its Indian foundations with great resourcefulness and originality. The play-impulse, perhaps also deliberate concealment, finds vent in punning translations, e.g. where 'America' is given by the literal rendering of 'merry key' and 'coffee' formed from the word meaning 'cough'! Logic, however, is shown in the ramifications of the root *kr*, which has apparently supplied not only the prolific nominal suffix *-kera* < *-krta*, enabling Welsh Gypsy to coin words for 'vegetarian,' 'umbrella' and 'comet,' but also the equally useful denominative verbal suffix *-er*, *-yer*. Greek adds to the stock the participial *-men* < *-μενος* and the verb-forming *-as* < *-αζω*, *-ιζω*. Petrified forms of the accusative, locative and ablative case supply many adverbs.

Of the eight noun-cases the locative is yielding ground. The genitive, a quasi-adjectival case, is a possessive in the widest sense, the partitive being expressed (as in Welsh side by side with *o*) by apposition. Unlike the case-system, the tense-system with its Present-Future, Imperfect, Preterite and Pluperfect has a close analogue in Welsh, where, in addition, we find the imperfect used in 'speculative' conditions and the pluperfect in 'privative' or unrealisable conditions. This wealth of inflexions imparts elasticity to the syntax and justifies many departures from the normal order, in which (as in Welsh) the verb takes the lead.

Through the vocabulary we could follow the trail of the Gypsies from North-Western India through Persia, Asia Minor, the Balkans and Central Europe right to our shores, as Professor Charlton has shown in his review in the *Manchester Guardian*. Supplementing him, I call attention to the cultural significance of the Slavic loans *kirčima* 'inn' and *smentena* 'cream,' for both passed into Middle High German about

the same time as *Kretscham* (whence *Kretschmer*) and *smant* (also *schmant*, *schmetten*, whence *Schmetterling*; cf. also the introduction into German of another Slavic dairy-word *twarc*, *Quark* 'curds' < *tvorogŭ*). This is a problem for those interested in the history of 'strong drinks' and of 'soft drinks' like *Yoghurt* as well! The loan-word *spiġa* 'pin' resembles the Piedmontese *spinga* rather than the Provençal forms; it can hardly be Old French, which dropped *s* in *sp-* in the thirteenth century (cf. Nyrop, *Grammaire historique de la langue française*, Vol. I, p. 411). The English loans point in the main to the dialects of the Welsh Marches. I note this in the phonology of *craun* (Shropsh.), *crud*, *handsteddŷ*, *laze* (Shropsh.), *sweddle*, *yit* and the geographical distribution of *bing*, *bunnell*, *fridge*, *prill*, *slut*. In the Welsh loans I have noticed the following curious fact: the Welsh feminines *cist* (chest), *migyn* (bog), *torlan* (bank of a stream) and *tympan* (drum) appear as *ġista*, *vigina*, *dorlĕna* and *dimpĕna* respectively, i.e. they show the lenition or soft mutation characteristic of all feminine nouns following the definite article in the singular. On the other hand the feminine *pabwyren* 'a rush' appears in Welsh Gypsy with initial *p* as *pabŕna*, likewise a feminine word. Why? Possibly (1) because the word was more frequently heard as a plural *pabwyr* 'rushes' and the plural is unmutated even after the definite article, (2) because there exists also a masculine *pabwyrŷn* in the more specific sense of 'bulrush,' and this would not be mutated in either number.

The Welsh comparisons throughout especially in the identification of place-names, personal names and song-tunes are beyond praise. In my gleanings I have found but a few thin and blasted ears which I bring to Dr Sampson's well-filled barns as a humble, but sincere tribute. The following notes embody some reflections on the possible influence of Welsh idiom on certain semantic developments, an influence to be expected in view of the bilingualism and even trilingualism of many speakers.

baval- 1. wind, 2. breath, cf. colloquial W. *gwynt* in both senses.

biĉav- 1. to send, 2. to escort, cf. W. *anfon* (in 'to send' usually replaced by *gyrru*, but still used of 'seeing' a person off).

kand 1. ear, 2. handle of a pot, cf. W. *clust* 'ear' as used in *clust cwpan* 'cup-handle,' etc.

kerio- 1. to boil, 2. to swarm, cf. W. *berwi* 'to boil,' also in *berwi o bryfed* 'to swarm with vermin,' etc.

naŝav- 1. to lose, 2. to spill a liquid, cf. W. *colli* 'to lose,' also in *colli dwfr* 'to spill water.'

pevras- 'to be dazzled.' Nearer than the English dialect-word *piver* 'to tremble' is the N. Welsh *pefrio* in the Gypsy sense, cf. Fynes-Clinton's Vocabulary of the Bangor Welsh s.v. *pevjo*.

praĉ- 'to rise, grow, build, clear up (of weather),' cf. for all senses the colloquial uses of W. *codi*.

p'ager- 1. to break, 2. to cut (syn. *ĉin*), 3. to quench (thirst), cf. W. *torri*, the senses of which are divided between *p'ager* and *ĉin*, but especially *torri syched* 'to quench one's thirst.'

In conclusion we must not forget to express our obligation to the Clarendon Press for its public-spirited support of such a notable and important work as this.

W. E. COLLINSON.

LIVERPOOL.

SHORT NOTICES

Miss E. P. Hammond's *Chaucer: A Bibliographical Manual* appeared in 1908. Students of Chaucer will therefore be grateful to Mr D. D. Griffith for his supplement, *A Bibliography of Chaucer 1908-24* (*University of Washington Publications in Language and Literature*. Vol. IV. The University Press, Seattle, Washington. 1926. 148 pp.). Mr Griffith has carefully classified his publications and added references to reviews of them. A few names are misspelt, e.g. we have 'Deansley' for 'Deanesly,' 'Gollanz' for 'Gollancz,' 'Jespersion' (in the Index) for 'Jespersen,' 'Machlose' (pp. 28, 34, 66) for 'Maclehose.'

G. C. M. S.

Under the title *Queen Elizabeth and a Swedish Princess* Miss Ethel Seaton has given us a very entertaining book, beautifully produced, as all the 'Haslewood Books' are, in an edition of 500 numbered copies (London: F. Etchells and H. Macdonald. 1926. 89 pp. 15s.). The nucleus is the prose account by James Bell (at one time a Fellow and Lecturer in Rhetoric of Trinity College, Oxford) of the ten months' journey from Stockholm to London of Princess Cecilia of Sweden, her husband and suite, in the years 1564 and 1565, and of the romantic admiration of the young English Queen which sustained the Princess in all dangers and hardships. (The last stage of the journey from Gravesend to Bedford House was clearly done by water. I am not sure that Miss Seaton realized this.) Bell's story—preserved in manuscript in the British Museum and first printed by Miss Morison in 1898, with some misreadings of proper names as we are told—has its interest as a specimen of English prose written by a professed student of rhetoric before the appearance of Ascham's *Scholemaster* or Lyly's *Euphues*. It has again undoubted interest as illustrating the vagaries of human psychology. It ends with the Princess's arrival in England and gracious reception by the Queen, and perhaps it is well. The ornate pen of the Oxonian rhetorician could hardly have bent to describe the farcical conclusion of the episode, when Princess Cecilia had outstayed her welcome, involved herself in debt and had been exposed to the unheard-of ignominy of hearing 'dyvers Englishe men crye and caule unto her sainge "paye us ower monye."' However this part of the story has been skilfully put together by Miss Seaton from a variety of sources. Her readers, though they may not look up the references to other literature—a very formidable list—which she has given them, will at least thank her for a very varied and delightful entertainment.

G. C. M. S.

No better present could be made to an intelligent boy reading his first Shakespearian play than Mr G. F. Bradby's *About Shakespeare and his Plays* (London: H. Milford. 92 pp. 2s. 6d.). Mr Bradby's views are in the main the traditional ones: but his sound sense, literary taste and gift of writing make his modest undertaking a model of its kind.

G. C. M. S.

The second volume of *The Poems of John Milton, English, Latin, Greek and Italian, arranged in chronological order with prefaces*, by Pro-

fessor H. J. C. Grierson (London: Chatto and Windus. 1925. lxiv + 371 pp. 12s. 6d.) is devoted to *Paradise Lost*. The editor in a valuable preface points out Milton's insistence in his later life on certain points in spelling, e.g. the use of 'thir' except where emphasis required 'their,' and the use of 'blanc' for white and 'blank' for mere negation, attention to the latter distinction leading to the interesting conclusion that 'the Universal blanc' which came to the poet with his blindness was a universal 'whiteness.' He shows the care bestowed by the poet on the second edition of *Paradise Lost*, which must be followed except in a very few places by all subsequent editors. Of Bentley's emendations only two deserve acceptance. As in his first volume Professor Grierson uses in general a modernized spelling, but is scrupulous to keep Milton's spelling wherever it has any special significance. This beautiful edition is one which every student will wish to possess. G. C. M. S.

Dr Paget Toynbee has given us another admirably edited book in *Satirical Poems published anonymously by William Mason with Notes by Horace Walpole now first printed from his Manuscript* (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1926. 158 pp.). Mason's poems, *An Heroic Epistle to Sir William Chambers* (1773), *An Heroic Postscript* (1774), *Ode to Mr Pinchbeck* (1776), *An Epistle to Dr Shebbeare to which is added An Ode to Sir Fletcher Norton* (1777), *Ode to the Naval Officers of Great Britain . . . after the Trial of Admiral Keppel* (1779), were annotated by Walpole in 1779 lest the allusions contained in them should 'become obscure to Posterity.' Walpole's commentary and notes in the original MS. were found by Dr Toynbee among the Walpoliana in the collection of the late Sir Francis Waller, Bt., and are now published for the first time as an accompaniment to the poems of Mason to which they refer and which are themselves not easily accessible. Dr Toynbee has added further notes of his own and in his introduction has traced the history of the composition of the poems and proved them to be undoubtedly Mason's work. (The last only was printed with his name.) Whether by his '*Exposé* of the Mystification' Dr Toynbee means a statement or an exposure, I am not sure. In either case, why use a French word? Aided by the notes one finds the poems very good reading. They raise our opinion of Mason's literary powers and throw much light on Whig and anti-Court feeling in the years of the disruption with America. But apart from its contents the book is an example of the beautiful printing of the Clarendon Press and is enriched with portraits of Mason, Chambers, Lord Sandwich ('Jemmy Twitcher'), Pinchbeck, Shebbeare and Norton, wonderfully reproduced from contemporary mezzotints, etc. It is seldom that a book has been so attractively presented. G. C. M. S.

In 1892 by the gift of Jane, Lady Shelley, the Bodleian Library became possessed of a collection of MSS. relating to Shelley and Mary Shelley, under the condition that none of the documents (except MSS. of Shelley's poems and letters already published either by Mrs Shelley or by Dowden) should be accessible to the public till after 8 July 1922, the centenary of Shelley's death. They were not therefore available for use by Mr R. Ingpen when preparing his edition of Shelley's letters

(1915). Although Dowden had seen practically all of them before 1892, it is still a great boon that the Curators of the Bodleian should now have given us the unpublished material in *The Shelley Correspondence in the Bodleian Library* (1926. xvi + 48 pp. 5s. post free from the Bodleian Library), carefully edited by Mr R. H. Hill. The correspondence consists of 44 letters, either not published at all or published incompletely—the longest being Shelley's letter of 3 November 1819, on the conviction of R. Carlisle for publishing Paine's *Age of Reason*, of which two sheets only out of five had been given to the public. The editor adds three very useful lists: (1) of other MSS. and Printed Books (not reserved) presented by Lady Shelley, (2) of MSS. relating to Shelley in the Bodleian, not part of Lady Shelley's donation, (3) of portraits and personal relics of the poet.

G. C. M. S.

Dr J. Postma may be congratulated on his choice of an excellent topic, *Tennyson as seen by his Parodists* (Amsterdam: H. J. Paris. 1926. 199 pp. 16 fl. 50). It is, however, a subject not very easy for a foreigner to handle, especially when so many Englishmen are still alive who have lived through a great part of the period treated. They will probably feel that Dr Postma's understanding of the currents of the later Victorian age is a little defective. This is the more serious as the author generally dismisses from examination parodies of purely literary interest, and restricts his attention to those which are critical of particular actions or opinions of the poet of a non-literary kind, especially his relation to the Court, his acceptance of a peerage, his vague theologising, his ambition to be a dramatist, his insistence on good pecuniary terms, his so-called 'Jingoism.' More justice would have been shown him if it had been pointed out that the sentiments put into the mouth of an hysterical young man in *Maud*, after all, reflected Carlyle's protest against the complacent acceptance of free-competition as a panacea, and that the patriotic songs *Hands all round!* and *The Fleet* were early expressions of an Imperialist movement, which was no doubt capable of being turned to evil, but which was a necessary precursor of the great rally of the Dominions and Colonies to the Mother-country seen in 1914. It was only natural that both the stands taken up by Tennyson should provoke opposition, but it is misleading to speak of 'the serious dissatisfaction this poem (*The Fleet*) had occasioned throughout the country' (p. 98). Dr Postma gives in an Appendix the text of fifty parodies, some of which are brilliant productions, others little more than imitative lampoons written by political or theological opponents. It is a pity however that this Appendix was not called Part II and that the parodies were not arranged in order of date with the authors' names attached, wherever known. At present to find the date or authorship of a poem one has to turn back to some earlier page.

G. C. M. S.

Das altfranzösische Rolandslied nach der Oxforder Handschrift (Sammlung romanischer Übungshefte, III, IV. Halle: M. Niemeyer. 1926. x + 135 pp. 3 M. 20), edited by Professor Alfons Hilka, presents the Oxford manuscript with what the editor considers the necessary minimum of textual alterations. In his method of procedure he takes a middle

course between what might be called the 'conservative' school (represented originally by Théodore Müller, latterly by Bédier and others) and the 'reconstructive' school (represented by Stengel in its extreme form, and recently to a less degree by Atkinson Jenkins). Any deviation from the text of O is clearly indicated either by a bracket or a footnote so that the original manuscript reading can be ascertained at a glance. The result is a very readable text, not disfigured by so many notes of exclamation, etc., as that of Gröber in 1909, not so scrupulously conservative in detail as that of Bédier in 1922. The text is printed consecutively, no space being allowed between the 'laisses' (except when a fresh episode is introduced), and each fresh 'laisse' being distinguished only by a large initial capital. The result is not a very happy one as the somewhat retardative style of the poem would seem more often than not to call for a slight pause between each individual 'laisse.'

A vocabulary has been added, also an index of proper names, and the much discussed problem of the rival methods of editing is briefly set forth in a preface in which, by a curious mischance, Professor Hilka has inadvertently stated (pp. vi and vii) the preference of a certain group of critics for Stengel's 'schema' as against Müller's 'schema' where he obviously means to say exactly the opposite.

J. C.

Mr Edward Noble Stone has in his verse translation of *Le Mystère d'Adam* (*Adam, a Religious Play of the Twelfth Century*. Washington: University of Washington Press. 1926. iii + 34 pp.) made a courageous and really skilful attempt to preserve the form of the original poem both as regards the variations of metre and the rhyme. The difficulties of such a task are obvious: the Old French octosyllabic line has a tolerable equivalent in the English line of the same number of syllables; but the Old French decasyllabic, with its pause after the fourth syllable, has an entirely different metrical value from its English parallel. Nor is it easy to combine literalness of rendering with metrical form, but the translator disarms criticism in this respect by his statement in the preface that 'a metrical and rhymed translation of a poem can be, at best, only a paraphrase.' In the main however this translation keeps remarkably close to the original and seems to us a clever piece of work. As regards the text the translator relies chiefly on Professor Studer's edition from the preface of which he also draws freely in the footnotes which form a running commentary to the translation.

J. C.

A Handbook of German Intonation, by M. L. Barker (Cambridge: W. Heffer. 1925. x + 102 pp. 5s.), is, the author tells us, the result of practical research carried on for some time in Germany; it is primarily designed for University students who have some knowledge of the language, but who have not had the opportunity of mastering the differences in intonation between English and German. A short statement of the fundamental principles of German intonation, clearly setting out the main divisions of 'tone-groups,' precedes a selection of prose extracts, graphically represented. Two methods of graphical representation are used—a simpler one, in which words are printed at varying levels to indicate pitch, and a completer method of representa-

tion by the use of dots placed above each syllable to indicate its pitch level. Some verse extracts, similarly treated, some notes on an experiment in the teaching of German intonation, and a few additional prose passages for practice, conclude a very useful little handbook. Every teacher of German knows the difficulty of making students realise the differences between German intonation and our own, and the book will be appreciated by all those who have experience in the subject. E. P.

A translation of Karl Philipp Moritz's autobiographical novel, *Anton Reiser*, published in the years 1785-90, seems overdue; and English readers will welcome this one by Mr P. E. Matheson in the *World's Classics* (London: H. Milford. 1926. xv + 456 pp. 2s.). The novel portrays only a part of Anton Reiser's life, but the period of life with which it deals—childhood and adolescence—is one which has great interest for the present age. The 'Bildungsroman' has appealed to German readers at all times since the novel became a popular form in the eighteenth century, and *Anton Reiser* is an early example of the type, more familiar to England in *Wilhelm Meister*, or in Keller's *Der grüne Heinrich*. Like all such novels, its interest is not only psychological, but also historical. The light thrown on the life and struggles of the poorer classes at the end of the eighteenth century, on the movements of religious thought, on education in schools and colleges, and on the lure of the stage and the acting profession cannot but interest those who care to study Germany in one of the most active periods of her literary history. The English translation is pleasant, and reproduces with fidelity both the somewhat remote external setting of the original and its charm of leisurely, intimate fulness of detail. E. P.

Miss H. M. Buckhurst's *Elementary Grammar of Old Icelandic* (London: Methuen. 1925. pp. 104. 5s.) is, as she suggests in her preface, most acceptable to those beginning to read Icelandic, for it is the first Icelandic Grammar to be published in the English language, independently of texts. It aims primarily at reducing the labour of learning Icelandic accidence and contains many devices (such as a carefully selected list of examples) for making it particularly suitable for beginners. The inclusion of short sections on syntax moreover is most useful. For all these things students are much indebted to Miss Buckhurst.

One suggestion however must be made. Is it not a fact that most of those beginning to read Icelandic are students who have already acquired or are acquiring some little knowledge of other Germanic languages, Anglo-Saxon, Gothic or Old High German? Such students could approach the accidence of a new Germanic language most easily from an absolutely scientific standpoint. It does not seem as if, had the whole of Miss Buckhurst's Grammar been arranged broadly and primarily on a scientific basis, it would have materially increased the labour of the student who had read no Germanic language previously, and it would certainly have simplified that of the student who had.

The addition of some extra notes on the forms of the Indefinite Pronouns, a parallel list of verb conjugations and examples of verbal forms with the negative suffix would make a very useful and practical little Grammar even more complete. D. E. M. C.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

September–November, 1926.

GENERAL.

- ERNST, F., *La tradition médiatrice de la Suisse aux XVIII^e et XIX^e siècles* (*Rev. litt. comp.*, vi, 4, Oct.).
- Essays in Memory of Barrett Wendell. By his Assistants. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 21s.
- FARINELLI, A., *Discorsi bresciani*. Padua, A. Milani.
- HARTOG, Sir PHILIP, *On the Relation of Poetry to Verse* (Engl. Assoc. Pamphlets, lxiv). London, H. Milford. 2s. 6d.
- HIRT, H., *Indogermanische Grammatik*. I. (Indogermanische Bibliothek, I, 1, xiii.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 15 M.
- KELLETT, E. E., *The Appreciation of Literature*. London, Epworth Press. 5s.
- KÜBLER, A., *Die romanischen und deutschen Örtlichkeitsnamen des Kantons Graubünden* (Sammlung roman. Elementar- und Handbücher, iii, 4). Heidelberg, C. Winter. 14 M.
- MATTHES, P., *Sprachform, Wort- und Bedeutungskategorie und Begriff* (Philosophie und Geisteswissenschaften, Buchreihe iii). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 5 M.
- PARTRIDGE, E., *A Critical Medley. Essays, Studies and Notes*. Paris, É. Champion. 35 fr.
- Phonetic Transcription and Transliteration. Proposals at the Copenhagen Conference, April, 1925. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1s. 6d.
- PLENZAT, K., *Die Theophiluslegende in den Dichtungen des Mittelalters* (Germanische Studien, xliii). Berlin, E. Ebering. 10 M.
- SARNO, A., *Scritti di filosofia del linguaggio*. Naples, Priv. printed.
- SCHMIDT, W., *Die Sprachfamilien und Sprachenkreise der Erde*. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 42 M.
- WALDE, A., *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Herausg. von J. Pokorny. II, 1. Berlin, W. de Gruyter. 12 M.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

- HOCHULI, E., *Einige Bezeichnungen für den Begriff Strasse, Weg und Kreuzweg im Romanischen*. Aarau, H. R. Sauerländer. 5 M.

Italian.

- AMBROSINI, L., *Teocrito, Ariosto, Minori e minimi*. Milan, 'Corbaccio.' L. 18.
- ANDREOLI, A., *Antologia storica della critica letteraria italiana*. I. Milan, Mondadori. L. 18.
- BARBIERA, R., *Ideali e caratteri dell' Ottocento*. Milan, Treves. L. 16.
- BIONDOLILLO, F., *La poesia di Giovanni Meli*. Catania, Studio edit. moderno. L. 8.
- BOIARDO, M. M., *L' Orlando innamorato*. Introd. e note di F. Foffano. I. Turin, Unione. L. 10.
- CARRARA, E., *Per un sonetto di Benvenuto Cellini* (*Giorn. stor.*, lxxxviii, 1, 2).
- CATALANO, M., *Messer Moschino* (Beoni e buffoni ai tempi di L. Ariosto) (*Giorn. stor.*, lxxxviii, 1, 2).

- CIECO DA FERRARA, F., *Libro d' arme e d' amore*, nomato Mambriano. Introd. di G. Rua. II, III. Turin, Unione. L. 12.
- CROCE, B., *Problemi della storia della cultura italiana* (*La Critica*, xxiv, 6, Nov.).
- DANTE ALIGHIERI, *La Divina Commedia*. Commentata da I. Del Lungo. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 50.
- DANTE, *The Minor Poems*. Transl. by L. de' Lucchi. London, H. Milford. 7s. 6d.
- DE RUBERTIS, A., V. Gioberti e la cattedra di filosofia morale in Pisa (*Giorn. stor.*, lxxxviii, 1, 2).
- DE SANCTIS, F., *Teoria e storia della letteratura*. Ricostruite sui quaderni della scuola da B. Croce. 2 vols. Bari, Laterza. L. 36.
- D'OVIDIO, F., *Studi danteschi*. 2 vols. Rome, 'Ape.' Each L. 25.
- FORCELLA, G., *D'Annunzio, 1863-84* (Guide bibliografiche). Turin, Soc. Ed. Internat. L. 12.
- GIAMPAGLIA, I., *Studio critico su Antonio Bruni*. Rome, Di Rubba. L. 7.50.
- HOARE, A., *A Short Italian Dictionary*. II. English-Italian. New ed. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 10s. 6d.
- MESTICA, G., *San Francesco, Dante e Giotto*. Macerata, Besson e Leopardi. L. 10.
- MOTH, F., *Francesco Petrarca og hans Børn*. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 3 kr. 50.
- ORANO, P., *I moderni*. V. Milan, Treves. L. 10.
- PORCELLI, G., *La letteratura italiana nella critica francese durante la monarchia de luglio (1830-48)*. Florence, Vallecchi. L. 18.
- PULCI, C., *Il Morgante Maggiore*. Con commento di N. Addamiano. Palermo, Sandron. L. 30.
- SCARPINI, M., *Il sistema religioso politico di Dante*. Florence, Libr. editr. Fiorentina. L. 10.
- TATHAM, E. H. R., *Francesco Petrarca*. II. London, Sheldon Press. 18s.
- WOLF, E., *Petrarca. Darstellung seines Lebensgefühls*. (Beitr. zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance, xxviii.) Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 4 M.

Spanish.

- CEJADOR Y FRAUCA, J., *La verdadera poesía castellana*. Madrid, Rev. de Archivos. 36 pes.
- FITZMAURICE-KELLY, J., *A New History of Spanish Literature*. London, H. Milford. 12s. 6d.
- GILI GAYA, S., *La entonación en el ritmo del verso* (*Rev. fil. españ.*, xiii, 2).
- GLASCOCK, C. C., *Two Modern Spanish Novelists* (Bazán, Valdés). Austin, Univ. of Texas.
- GROSSMANN, R., *Das ausländische Sprachgut im Spanischen des Rio de la Plata. Ein Beitrag zum Problem der argentinischen Nationalsprache*. Hamburg, Seminar für roman. Sprachen. 11 M.
- IRVING, WASHINGTON, *Diary. Spain, 1828-29*. Edited from the MS. in the Library of the Hispanic Society of America by C. L. Penney. New York, Hispanic Society.
- MELÉNDEZ, C., *Amado Nervo*. New York, Instituto de las Españas. 80 c.
- MONTESINOS, J. F., *Notas sobre algunas poesías de Lope de Vega* (*Rev. fil. españ.*, xiii, 2).
- NEBRIJA, *Gramatica de la lengua castellana, 1492*. Ed. by I. González-Llubera. London, H. Milford. 18s.

- PEREZ PASTOR, C., Noticias y documentos a la Historia y Literatura españolas. III. (Memorias de la Real Acad. española, xii.) Madrid, Rev. de Archivos. 10 pes.
- QUEVEDO, F. DE, The Choice Humorous and Satirical Works. Ed. by C. Duff. (Broadway Translations.) London, G. Routledge. 12s. 6d.
- SPITZER, L., Notes étymologiques (*Rev. fil. esp.*, xiii, 2).
- TREND, J. B., Alfonso the Sage and other Spanish Essays. London, Constable. 12s.
- VOSSLER, K., Realismus in der spanischen Dichtung der Blütezeit. Festrede. Munich, R. Oldenbourg. 1 M. 50.

French.

(a) *General (incl. Linguistic).*

- CLÉDAT, L., En marge des grammaires (*Rev. phil. franç.*, xxxviii, 1).
- GAMILLSCHLAG, E., Etymologisches Wörterbuch der französischen Sprache. Lief. 3-5. (Sammlung Elementar- und Handbücher, iii, 5.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. Each 2 M.
- PIQUET, F., Le patois de Dombas (Meuse) (*Rev. phil. franç.*, xxxviii, 1).
- SECHÉHAYE, A., Essai sur la structure logique de la phrase. Paris, É. Champion. 36 fr.

(b) *Old French.*

- GLASER, K., Altfranzösisches Lesebuch des späteren Mittelalters (Sammlung kurzer Lehrbücher der roman. Sprachen, ix). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 7 M.
- LORRIS, G. DE, et J. DE MEUN, Le Roman de la Rose. 5 vols. Paris, É. Champion. 250 fr.
- Raoul de Cambrai. Transl. by Jessie Crosland (Medieval Library). London, Chatto and Windus. 5s.

(c) *Modern French.*

- ALEXANDER, S., Molière and Life (Bull. of the John Rylands Library). Manchester, Univ. Press. 1s.
- BELIS, A., La Critique française à la fin du XIX^e siècle. Paris, J. Gamber. 30 fr.
- Book of French Verse, A. Collected by St John Lucas. New ed. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 4s.
- BRAUNSCHVIG, M., La littérature française contemporaine, étudiée dans les textes, 1850-1925. Paris, A. Colin.
- CARRÉ, J. M., Michelet et son temps. Paris, Perrin. 12 fr.
- CHATEAUBRIAND, F. R. DE, Les Aventures du dernier Abencérage, éd. par P. Hazard et M. J. Durry (Bibl. de la Revue de litt. comp., xxvii). Paris, H. Champion. 35 fr.
- CHATEAUBRIAND, F. R. DE, Selections. Ed. by G. Roger. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 4s. 6d.
- CONS, L., L'Auteur de la farce de Pathelin (Elliott Monographs, xvii). Princeton, Univ. Press. \$1.80.
- DUHAMEL, G., Œuvres. IV. Paris, Mercure de France. 20 fr.
- FRANCE, A., Œuvres complètes. VII. Paris, Calmann-Lévy. 35 fr.
- FRANÇOIS, A., La correspondance de J. J. Rousseau dans la querelle littéraire du XVIII^e siècle (*suite*) (*Rev. d'hist. litt.*, xxxiii, 3).
- HELM FLOYD, J., Les femmes dans la vie de Balzac. Paris, Plon. 15 fr.
- JONES, P. M., Émile Verhaeren. Cardiff, Univ. of Wales Press; London, H. Milford. 7s. 6d.
- MAES, P., G. Rodenbach. Paris, E. Figuière. 12 fr.

- MAUGAIN, G., *Ronsard en Italie* (Publ. de l'Univ. de Strasbourg, ii, 2). Paris, Les Belles Lettres. 15 fr.
- MEUNIER, P. A., *Émile Montégut*. Paris, Garnier. 12 fr.
- RAUHUT, F., *Das Romantische und Musikalische in der Lyrik S. Mallarmés* (Die Neueren Sprachen, Beiheft xi). Marburg, N. G. Elwert. 2 M. 50.
- RIDDLE, L. M., *The Genesis and Sources of P. Corneille's Tragedies from 'Médée' to 'Pertharite.'* Paris, Les Presses universitaires. \$1.25.
- ROUSSEAU, J. J., *Les Confessions*. I-III. Paris, Garnier. Each vol. 30 fr.
- Saint Joan of Orleans, *Scenes from the Fifteenth-century Mystère du Siège d'Orléans*. Transl. and ed. by J. Evans and P. Studer. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d.
- SCHINZ, A., *Bibliographie critique de J. J. Rousseau dans les cinq dernières années* (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xli, 7, Nov.).
- SCHUTZ, A. H., *The Nature and Influence of Charles Nodier's Philological Activity* (*Stud. in Phil.*, xxiii, 4, Oct.).
- SCHWARTZ, W. L., *L'Influence de la poésie japonaise sur la poésie française contemporaine* (*Rev. litt. comp.*, vi, 4, Oct.).
- SERVAL, M., *Autour d'un roman de Balzac: 'Le lys dans la vallée'* (*Rev. d'hist. litt.*, xxxiii, 3).
- SHERARD, R. H., *The Life, Work and Evil Fate of Guy de Maupassant*. London, W. Laurie. 21s.
- SOULA, C., *La poésie et la pensée de Stéphane Mallarmé*. Paris, É. Champion. 12 fr.
- VAUGHAN, C. E., *Goethe and Hugo* (Bull. of the John Rylands Library). Manchester, Univ. Press. 1s. 6d.
- VIER, J. A., *L'activité d'une académie provinciale au XVIII^e siècle (L'Académie de Stanislaus de 1750 à 1766)* (*Rev. d'hist. litt.*, xxxiii, 3).
- WADE, I. O., *The 'Philosophe' in the French Drama of the Eighteenth Century* (Elliott Monographs, xviii). Princeton, Univ. Press. \$1.50.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Scandinavian.

- BUKDAHL, J., *Det skjulte Norge*. Copenhagen, H. Aschehoug.
- GEISMAR, E., *S. Kierkegaard. Hans Livsudvikling og Forfattervirksomhed*. I. Copenhagen, Gad. 3 kr. 50.
- HAUCH, C., *En polsk Familie*. I, II. Udg. af P. Schjærff. (Danmarks National-litteratur, iii.) Copenhagen, Holberg-Selskabet. 8 kr. 50.
- HEIKEL, I. A., J. L. Runeberg. *Hans liv och hans diktning*. I, II. Stockholm, Natur och Kultur. 12 kr.
- LAMM, M., *Strindbergs dramer*. II. Stockholm, A. Bonnier. 9 kr.
- MOE, MOLTKE, *Samlede Skrifter*. Utgitt ved K. Liestol. (Instit. for sammenlignende Kulturforskning.) Oslo, H. Aschehoug. 9 kr.

Dutch, Frisian.

- BARNOUW, A. J., *Vondel*. Haarlem, H. D. Tjeenk Willink. 3 fl. 60.
- HOOF, B. H. VAN 'T, *Das holländische Volksbuch vom Doktor Faust*. The Hague, M. Nijhoff. 6 fl.
- SELMER, E. W., *Über den Gebrauch des bestimmten Artikels im Nordfriesischen* (Skrifter utg. av det Norske Videnskaps-Akad. i Oslo, II, 2). Oslo, J. Dybwad. 8 kr.
- WIJNPERSSE, A. G. M. VAN DE, *Die Dietse vertaling van Suso's Horologium aeternae sapientiae*. Groningen, J. B. Wolters. 6 fl. 60.

English.*(a) General (incl. Linguistic).*

BEACH, J. W., *The Outlook for American Prose*. Chicago, Univ. Press; Cambridge, Univ. Press. 12s. 6d.

English Prose and Poetry. Selected and annotated by J. M. Manly. Revised ed. Boston, Ginn & Co. \$3.20.

JESPERSEN, O., *Notes on Relative Clauses*; SCOTT, F. N., *American Slang*. (S.P.E. Tract, No. xxiv.) Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2s. 6d.

KIHLBOM, A., *A Contribution to the Study of Fifteenth-Century English*. I. (Uppsala Universitets årsskrift, 1926.) Uppsala, A. B. Lundequist. 7 kr. 50.

SELINCOURT, B. DE, *Pomona, or the Future of English*. London, Kegan Paul. 2s. 6d.

WEEKLEY, E., *Words, Ancient and Modern*. London, J. Murray. 5s.

(b) Old and Middle English.

BISSET, HABAKKUK, *The Rolment of Courtis*. III. Ed. by Sir Philip J. Hamilton-Grierson. (Scottish Text Society.) Edinburgh, W. Blackwood.

JOHANNES DE IRLANDIA, *The Meroure of Wyssdome*. I. Ed. by C. Macpherson. (Scottish Text Society.) Edinburgh, W. Blackwood.

Libelle of Englyshe Polycye, The. *A Poem on the Use of Sea-Power, 1436*. Ed. by Sir G. Warner. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 10s. 6d.

Select Translations from Old English Poetry. Ed. by A. S. Cook and C. B. Tinker. Revised ed. Boston, Ginn & Co. \$1.48.

(c) Modern English.

ABERCROMBIE, L., *Romanticism*. London, M. Secker. 6s.

ALBRIGHT, E. M., 'The Faerie Queene' in *Masque at the Gray's Inn Revels* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 3, Sept.).

ALEXANDER, P., 'The Taming of a Shrew' (*Times Lit. Suppl.*, Sept. 16).

BLANKENAGEL, J. C., Shaw's 'Saint Joan' and Schiller's 'Jungfrau von Orleans' (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxv, 3).

BRIE, F., *Englische Rokoko-Epik*. Munich, M. Hueber. 4 M. 50.

BROOKE, TUCKER, *Shakespeare of Stratford*. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 4s. 6d.

BURDETT, O., *William Blake*. London, Macmillan. 5s.

CAWLEY, R. R., Shakspeare's Use of the Voyagers in 'The Tempest' (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 3, Sept.).

CLUTTON BROCK, A., *Essays on Literature and Life*. London, Methuen. 6s.

COLLINS, A. S., *The Growth of the Reading Public during the Eighteenth Century* (*Rev. Engl. Stud.*, ii, 8, Oct.).

COWLEY, A., *The Mistress*. With other Select Poems. Ed. by J. Sparrow. London, Nonesuch Press. 18s.

DRINKWATER, J., *A Book for Bookmen, being edited Manuscripts and Marginalia, with Essays*. London, Dulau. 7s. 6d.

ELIOT, G., *Letters of*. Selected by R. B. Johnson. London, J. Lane. 6s.

FIELDING, H., *Tom Jones* (The Shakespeare Head Edition). 4 vols. Oxford, B. Blackwell. Each 7s. 6d.

FRERE, J. HOOKHAM, *The Monks and the Giants*. Ed. by R. D. Waller. Manchester, Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.

GAW, A., *The Evolution of the 'Comedy of Errors'* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 2, Sept.).

- GAY, JOHN, Poetical Works. Ed. by G. C. Faber. London, H. Milford. 3s. 6d.
- GODWIN, W., An Enquiry concerning Political Justice. 2 vols. Ed. and abridged by R. A. Preston. London, A. Knopf. 8s. each.
- GRAHAM, W., The Beginnings of English Literary Periodicals, 1665-1715. New York, Oxford Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 11s. 6d.
- HUGHES, H. S., The Middle-Class Reader and the English Novel (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxv, 3).
- HUGHES, M. Y., Burton on Spenser (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 3, Sept.).
- JOHNSON, S., The Critical Opinions of. Arranged and compiled by J. E. Brown. Princeton, Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 31s. 6d.
- JONES, H. S. V., The Faerie Queene and the Mediaeval Aristotelian Tradition (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxv, 3).
- KREIPE, C. E., Milton's 'Samson Agonistes' (Studien zur engl. Phil., lxx). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 3 M. 40.
- LANDRUM, G. W., Spenser's Use of the Bible and his alleged Puritanism (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 3, Sept.).
- LEGOVIS, É., The Bacchic Element in Shakespeare's Plays (British Academy, Shakespeare Lecture, 1926). London, H. Milford. 1s.
- LEGOVIS, É., Spenser. London, Macmillan. 8s. 6d.
- MASSINGER, P., A New Way to Pay Old Debts. Ed. by A. H. Cruickshank. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 6s.
- MESSAC, R., Bulwer Lytton et Dostoievski (*Rev. litt. comp.*, vi, 4, Oct.).
- MILTON, J., Poems in English. With Illustrations by W. Blake. Paradise Lost; Miscellaneous Poems. 2 vols. London, Nonesuch Press. 47s. 6d.
- MUIR, E., Transition: Essays in Contemporary Literature. London, Hogarth Press. 7s. 6d.
- NETHERCOT, A. H., Abraham Cowley's 'Discourse concerning Style' (*Rev. of Engl. Stud.*, ii, 8, Oct.).
- NEWBOLT, Sir H., Studies Green and Gray. London, T. Nelson. 7s. 6d.
- NICOLSON, M. H., Milton and Hobbes (*Stud. in Phil.*, xxiii, 4, Oct.).
- O'SULLIVAN, M. I., Hamlet and Dr Timothy Bright (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 3, Sept.).
- Oxford Book of Eighteenth Century Verse, The. Chosen by D. Nichol Smith. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 8s. 6d.
- POPE, E. F., The Critical Background of the Spenserian Stanza (*Mod. Phil.*, xxiv, 1).
- POPE, E. F., Renaissance Criticism and the Diction of 'The Faerie Queene' (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 3, Sept.).
- RALEIGH, Sir WALTER A., On Writing and Writers, being Extracts from his Notebooks, ed. by G. Gordon. London, E. Arnold. 6s.
- REED, A. W., Early Tudor Drama: Medwall, the Rastells, Heywood and the More Circle. London, Methuen. 10s. 6d.
- ROBERTSON, J. M., The Problems of the Shakespeare Sonnets. London, G. Routledge. 15s.
- SHAKESPEARE, W., As You Like It. Ed. by Sir A. Quiller-Couch and J. Dover Wilson. (The New Shakespeare.) Cambridge, Univ. Press. 6s.
- SMOLLETT, T., The Letters of, ed. by E. S. Noyes. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. \$3.
- SPENCER, H., Improving Shakespeare: Bibliographical Notes on Restoration Adaptations (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 3, Sept.).

- SPRAGUE, A. C., Beaumont and Fletcher on the Restoration Stage. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. \$4.
- Typical Elizabethan Plays (excluding Shakespeare). Ed. by F. E. Schelling. London, Harper. 12s. 6d.
- WEDEL, T. O., On the Philosophical Background of 'Gulliver's Travels' (*Stud. in Phil.*, xxiii, 4, Oct.).
- WILLIAMS, O., Some Great English Novels. Studies in the Art of Fiction. London, Macmillan. 8s. 6d.

German.

(a) General (incl. Linguistic).

- BECK, E., Lautlehre der oberen Markgräfler Mundart (Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken deutscher Mundarten, x). Halle, Waisenhaus. 12 M.
- KIESERITZKY, E., Die Schönheit unserer Muttersprache. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 8 M.
- LOKOTSCH, K., Etymologisches Wörterbuch der amerikanischen (indianischen) Wörter im Deutschen (Germanische Bibliothek, I, iv, 6). Heidelberg, C. Winter. 3 M. 50.
- SCHWARZ, E., Die germanischen Reibelaute s, f, ch im Deutschen (Schriften der deutschen wissenschaftl. Gesellschaft in Reichenberg, I). Reichenberg, Stiefel. 2 M. 70.

(b) Old and Middle High German.

- KISSLING, H., Die Ethik Frauenlobs (Heinrichs von Meissen) (Sächsische Forschungsinstitute in Leipzig, I, 3). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 4 M.
- SCHRÖTER, E., Walahfrids deutsche Glossierung zu den biblischen Büchern Genesis bis Regum II und der althochdeutsche Tatian (Hermaea, xvi). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 12 M.
- WEISSER, H., Die deutsche Novelle im Mittelalter. Freiburg, Herder. 5 M.

(c) Modern German.

- BAB, J., Die Chronik des deutschen Dramas. V. 1919-26. Berlin, Oesterheld. 6 M. 50.
- BODE, W., Goethes Leben. IX. Herausg. von V. Tornius. Berlin, E. S. Mittler. 9 M.
- BRÜGGEMANN, F., Versuch einer Zeitfolge der Dramen des Herzogs Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig. Aachen, Verlags- und Druckerei-Gesellschaft. 2 M.
- BURDAOH, K., Vorspiel. II. Goethe und sein Zeitalter. (Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift, Buchreihe, iii.) Halle, M. Niemeyer. 22 M. 50.
- BUTLER, E. M., The Saint Simonian Religion in Germany. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 21s.
- CASTLE, E., In Goethes Geist. Vorträge und Aufsätze. Vienna, Öster. Bundesverlag. 13 M.
- DEHORN, W., Th. Mann, eine philosophisch-literarische Studie (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxv, 3).
- ERMATINGER, E., Barock und Rokoko in der deutschen Dichtung (Gewalten und Gestalten, iv). Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 7 M. 20.
- FRANKENBERGER, J., Walpurgis. Zur Kunstgestalt von Goethes Faust (Staat und Geist, ii). Leipzig, E. Wiegandt. 3 M. 50.
- GOETHE, J. W. VON, Werke. Fests Ausgabe. Herausg. von R. Petsch. VI-XIII. (Meyer's Klassiker-Ausgaben.) Leipzig, Bibliographisches Institut. Each 4 M. 25.

- Goethe-Gesellschaft, Jahrbuch der. Herausg. von M. Hecker. XII. Weimar Goethe-Gesellschaft.
- Goethe Society, Publications of the English. New Series, III. Papers read before the Society, 1924-26. Ed. by J. G. Robertson. London, A. Moring.
- Grillparzer-Gesellschaft, Jahrbuch der. XXVIII. Herausg. von K. Glossy. Vienna, Amalthea. 6 M.
- HEBEL, J. P., Briefe. Eine Nachlese. Herausg. von K. Obser. Karlsruhe, C. F. Müller. 3 M.
- HERMANN, C., Die Weltanschauung G. Hauptmanns in seinen Werken (Philosophische Reihe, lxxxii). Berlin, Paetel. 1 M.
- JAEGER, H., Clemens Brentanos Frühlyrik. Chronologie und Entwicklung. (Deutsche Forschungen, xvi.) Frankfurt, M. Diesterweg. 9 M.
- KIENAST, R., J. V. Andreae und die vier echten Rosenkreutzer-Schriften (Palaestra, clii). Leipzig, Mayer und Müller. 16 M.
- KIES, P. P., The Sources and Basic Mode of Lessing's 'Miss Sara Sampson' (*Mod. Phil.*, xxiv, 1).
- LEWAK, A., Gottfried Keller und der polnische Freiheitskampf vom Jahre 1863-64. Zürich, Orell Füssli. 4 M. 80.
- MALLON, O., Brentano-Bibliographie. Berlin, S. M. Fraenkel. 12 M.
- MUTHESIUS, K., Goethe und das Handwerk. Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 5 M. 40.
- PHILIPS, F. C. A., F. Nicolais literarische Bestrebungen. The Hague, W. P. van Stoekum. 6 fl.
- PORITZKY, J. E., F. Hemsterhuis. Seine Philosophie und ihr Einfluss auf die deutschen Romantiker. (Philosophische Reihe, lxxxi.) Berlin, Paetel. 1 M. 40.
- ROGGE, A., Das Problem der dramatischen Gestaltung im deutschen Lustspiel. Hamburg, R. Hermes. 1 M. 50.
- SCHEUFFLER, G., Clara Viebig. Erfurt, M. Beute. 5 M.
- SCHMEER, H., Der Begriff der 'Schönen Seele' besonders bei Wieland (Germanische Studien, xlv). Berlin, E. Ebering. 3 M. 20.
- SCOTT, A. A., Betty Paoli: an Austrian Poetess of the Nineteenth Century. London, G. Routledge. 7s. 6d.
- SIMON, C., Le sillage de Stendhal en Allemagne (*Rev. litt. comp.*, vi, 4, Oct.).
- WEBER, P. C., America in Imaginative German Literature in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century (Columbia Univ. Germanic Studies). New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 12s. 6d.
- WUKADINOVIĆ, S., Goethe-Probleme. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 3 M. 60.

THE ENDING '-STER'

ALL historical grammars and all dictionaries say that the ending *-ster* was at first a special feminine ending, which was later applied to men as well as to women. I believe this to be entirely false, and I shall try to prove my contention that the ending from the very first was used for both sexes.

The transition of a special feminine ending to one used of men also is, so far as I can see, totally unexampled in all languages. Words denoting both sexes may in course of time be specialised so as to be used of one sex only, but not the other way. Can we imagine, for instance, a word meaning originally a woman judging being adopted as an official name for a male judge? Yet, according to *N.E.D.*, *deemster* or *dempster*, M.E. *demestre*, is 'in form fem. of *dēmere*, *deemer*.' Family names, too, would hardly be taken from names denoting women doing certain kinds of work: yet this is assumed for family names like *Baxter*, *Brewster*, *Webster*; their use as personal names is only natural under the supposition that they mean exactly the same as *Baker*, *Brewer*, *Weaver* or *Web*, i.e., a man whose business or occupation it is to bake, brew or weave.

Some of those who take the usual theory for granted seem to have felt the difficulty of accounting for the transition from fem. to masc. Bosworth writes with regard to *bæcestre* (*baxter*): 'because afȳrde men (eunuchs) performed that work which was originally done by females, this occupation is here denoted by a feminine termination' (with reference to *Genesis*, xl, 1). But were eunuchs ever denoted by specially feminine endings? Were eunuchs regularly employed in baking in England? And how would that affect the names of other occupations? Much less absurd is the modification of this theory given by Kluge, who says that the transition from fem. to masc. has to be explained through the supposition that when female work was transferred to men, the feminine denomination, too, was transferred. Similarly in *N.E.D.*: 'In northern M.E., however, perhaps owing to the frequent adoption by men of trades like weaving, baking, tailoring, etc., the suffix came very early to be used, indiscriminately with *-er*, as an agential ending irrespective of gender, thus in the *Cursor Mundi* (a. 1300) *demestre* (see *dempster*) appears instead of *demere* (*deemer*), a judge, *bemestre* instead of *bemer*,

a trumpeter.' These two examples, at any rate, do not substantiate the reasoning, for they did not denote trades formerly belonging to women. Nor does it seem very probable, even admitting that men began to take over what had formerly been women's work, that they would then submit to having the feminine name applied to them, least of all if there was by the side of it a male form, as was the case with *web*, *weaver*, *baker*, etc. I do not know whether the social part of the theory holds good, but the linguistic part, at any rate, is open to grave doubt.

Another explanation is offered by Emerson, who says that 'with the loss of grammatical gender the significance of these suffixes was also lost, so that *-ster* for instance came to be regarded as masculine.' He does not say what other endings were changed in the same way, as implied in his words 'for instance' (*History of English Language*, 1894, p. 304). The only other ending mentioned in the same section is *-ess*, but that has always been restricted to females. But his theory is wrong: the loss of the old gender system means, on the contrary, a strengthening of the linguistic expressions for sex, which were now liberated from the disturbing influence of the old chaos. Sweet says that when in M.E. the ending *-estre* lost the final *-e*, 'the resulting *-ster* came to be regarded as an emphatic form of *-er*, and consequently was applied to men as well as to women.' This is repeated by Franz (*Shakespeare-Grammatik*) with the addition that Romanic words like *master*, *mister*, *minister*, *pastor*, may have contributed to the aberration of the feeling for this ending ('beirrend auf das sprachgefühl eingewirkt'). But such formal analogies do not seem powerful enough to bring about so far-reaching a change; besides, they cannot have existed previous to the M.E. period, but the change, if change there was, began in Old English. As already hinted, such an unexampled aberration never took place: the ending from the very first beginning was a two-sex ending.

There is one thing about these formations which would make them very exceptional if the ordinary explanation were true: in all languages it seems to be the rule that in feminine derivatives of this kind, the feminine ending is added to some word which in itself means a male person, thus *princess* from *prince*, *waitress* from *waiter*, not *waitess* from the verb *wait*. But in the O.E. words *-estre* is not added to a masculine agent noun; we find, not *hleaperestre*, but *hleapestre*, not *bæcerestre*, but *bæcestre*, thus direct from the nominal or verbal root or stem. This fact is in exact accordance with the hypothesis that the words are just ordinary agent nouns, that is, primarily two-sex words.

We now come to the actual occurrence of such words.

If we look at the facts impartially, we see that from the very first words formed with this ending were very frequently applied to males, some even exclusively so. It is true that some are found with the feminine meaning only, but these are chiefly formations created on the spur of the moment by glossarists who wanted a translation of a Latin feminine (see below). Most, if not all, of the words belonging to actual living speech were evidently two-sex words from the first, and like most two-sex words denoted occupations chiefly followed by men.

But these facts are disguised by lexicographers, preoccupied as they are with the current theory of this ending as exclusively or originally feminine. See thus Bosworth-Toller, s.v. *seamestre* f.: 'though the noun is feminine it seems not confined to females, cf. *bæcestre*.' *Ibid.*, *Suppl.*: '*byrdestre*, an; f. an embroideress.' This in spite of the fact that the only place in which the word occurs is the Erfurt Gloss. (see Sweet, *Oldest English Texts*, 109, 1153), where it translates two Latin masculines *blaciaris*, *primicularis*. *Ibid.*, *Suppl.*: '*wæscestre*, an; f. one who washes (1) used of a man: *Iobinus wæs min wæscestre* (fullo)... (2) of a woman.' The words are thus said to be fem. even when used of men. Cf. also *N.E.D.* *washester*, 'a female washer (of linen), a washer-woman: In O.E. also applied to a man.' One curious word is also given in all our dictionaries as feminine, namely *wæpenwifestre*, which translates *hermafroditus*. (*Wæpen*, weapon, used of *membrum virile*.)

Napier, in his edition of the Digby glosses (*Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Oxford, 1900, no. 4735), thinks that the gloss *luctatorum cemp* [Napier supplies *cempena*] *plegestra* needs some explanation and adds the following note: 'The mention of *Ruffina* and *Secunda*, which immediately follows, suggested to the gloss. that female athletes were meant'—certainly a very strange suggestion, how then are we to account for *cempena*? It is much more natural to think that *plegestre*, which occurs only here, simply means the same thing as the Latin word, namely a wrestler or boxer, thus primarily a male; it is thus an exact synonym of the other derivatives *plegere* and *plegmann*. Bosworth-Toller innocently says '*plegestre*, an; f. a female athlete.'

In a short tale of the marvels of the East printed by Cockayne (*Narratiunculae Anglice conscriptae*, 1861, p. 38) we find the mention of women with long beards, of whom it is said: '*þa syndan huntigystran swiðe genemde*,' thus with our ending; but the passage does not necessarily imply that *huntigystre* was used exclusively of women; it may have meant the same thing as *hunters* in a modern translation: 'these women are very able hunters.'

I have already mentioned that *bæcestre* occurs in *Genesis* applied to a man (there also the acc. pl. *bæcestran* and the gen. pl. *bæcistra*, see below). The same word is given in Ælfric's *Grammar* as a translation of the masc. *pistor*. The way in which this ending is treated in this *Grammar* is very characteristic, for on p. 190 Ælfric says: '*sarcio*... of ðam is sartor *seamystre*, sartrix *heo*.' Here, then, the *-stre* word is given primarily as translation of the Latin masculine, and when he comes to think of the Latin fem. *sartrix*, he only adds the English fem. pronoun *heo*, showing thereby that *seamystre* is a two-sex word. But in other places where he has to translate two Latin words, one masc. and the other fem., he uses for the first the ending *-ere*, and for the second *-stre*: saltator *hleapere*, saltatrix *hleapestre*, etc. This is the usual practice of the old glossarists: when they have to render two Latin words, of which the masc. is naturally placed first, they use the ordinary O.E. word (generally in *-ere*) first, and then when the fem. has to be translated they have recourse to the *-stre* word, which was applicable to both sexes, and which, moreover, reminded them of the Latin ending *-trix*. Thus we find in Wright-Wülcker's collection, p. 188, textor *webba*, textrix *webbestre*; p. 190, citharedus *hearpere*, citharistria (sic) *hearpestre*; p. 308, cantor *sangere*, cantrix *sangystre*, lector *rædere*, lectrix *rædistre*; p. 311, fidican *fiðelere*, fidicina *fiþelestre*, saltator *hleapere*, saltatrix *hleapestre*; p. 312, sartor *seamere*, sartrix *seamestre*. Some of the words given in this way in glossaries never occur outside these glossaries and are thus open to the suspicion that they did not really belong to the language, but were created for the nonce by the learned translator (*fylgestre*, *hoppestre*). But these words naturally impressed nineteenth-century grammarians strongly.

In a later glossary (Wright-Wülcker, pp. 685 ff.) the glossator does not treat the Latin masculines and feminines at the same place, and the result is curious. First he has a collection of masculines, where in between words like hic emptor *a byer*, hic faber *a smythe*, etc., we find some with our ending: hic textor *a webster*, hic tinctor *a lytster*, hic victillarius *a hukster*, hic plummarius *a plumstere*, hic pistor *a baxter*. But later he has a collection of *nomina artificium mulierum*, and there we find, among others, hec pectrix *a kempster*, and in the same way *webster*, *sewster*, *baxter*, *dryster*, *brawdster*, *salster*, *huckster*, thus partly the same words as those already given under the males; here he also has some words in *-er*, which thus are shown also to be two-sex words: hec tontrix *a barbor*, hec filatrix *a spyenner*, hec lotrix *a lawnder*. On p. 693 there is a collection of *nomina iugulatarum* (sic) *mulierum*, but

they have all of them *-er*, not *-ster*: *hec citharista a herper*, *hec tubicina a trumper*...*hec saltatrix a tumbler*, etc., thus with English two-sex words.

It must be admitted that some words in *-stre* are used of women in texts and not only in glossaries. I give those I have found in the form in which they occur with indication of case: *crencestræn* acc., *hoppystre* d., *lærestran* acc., *lættewestran* acc., *semestran* acc., *wæscestran* acc., *witegystre* nom., *witegestran* nom. pl.

The ending *-estre* in O.E. is also used to form two names of animals, in which it is impossible to think of it as a special designation for the female: *hulfestre* 'plover' (pluvialis) and *loppestre*, mod. *lobster*. The latter is a modification of Lat. *locusta*; the change presupposes the previous existence of our suffix.

One of the reasons why people have always stuck to the feminine theory is evidently the fact that the words are weakly inflected: words with nom. in *-e* and the other cases in *-an* belong to the feminine *n*-stems (like *tunge*, *eorðe*, etc.). The corresponding masculines have *-a* in the nom. This is evidently a difficulty in the way of the two-sex view, but when we notice that all the examples of *n*-flexion are found when the words were applied to women, and that there are also some forms of the strong declensions (*-jo*-stems as in *-ere*): *bæcistra* gen. pl. masc. (not *-ena*), *plegestra*, gen. pl. masc. and *sæmestres* (gen. sg. masc.—in a charter of dubious authenticity), the possibility is not excluded that we should really distinguish two O.E. forms, one *-stre*, gen. *-stres* masc., and the other *-stre*, gen. *-stran* fem. However, *bæcestran* acc. pl., used of men, is an *n*-stem.

If we leave the O.E. period we see that Chaucer has some *-ster* words, which in modern editions are given as fem., but may just as well be taken as two-sex words: A 240 'He knew the tavernes wel in every town, And everich hostiler and *tappestere* Bet than a lazar or a *beggestere*'; C 477 'And right anon than comen *tombesteres* Fetys and smale, and yonge *fruytesteres*, Singers with harpes, baudes, wafereres' (cf. also A 3336). Some of these refer to men rather than to women.

In *Promptorium Parvulorum*, *webstar* and *weuere* are given as indifferent equivalents of *textor*, *textrix*. And *Piers Plowman*: 'Wollene websteris and weueris of linnen,' shows that the distinction between the two words was not one of sex, but had reference to the material woven. *Wabster* to this day is common in Scotland of a man, it occurs in Burns. Some of the examples given in *N.E.D.* under (*a*) as fem., are really common-

sex: 'Scho was the forrest webster pat man findes o pat mister' can no more be adduced as a proof that the word was specially fem. than a modern sentence like 'she is a fibster' or 'a liar' proves that *fibster* and *liar* are now feminines.

So much is certain that all the words that have had vitality enough to survive into the modern period, as well as all those that have been formed during recent times, are two-sex words, and that a great many of them are even chiefly used of males. I give all the important and a few unimportant ones: *baxter*; *boomster* (recent slang, one who works up a boom, a speculator: Wells: the factory-syren voice of the modern 'boomster,' Perrett, *Phonetic Theory*, p. 23); *drugster* (†); *dyester* or *dexter* (Sc. 'dyer,' not of women); *brewster*; *deemster* or *dempster*; *fibster*; *gamester* (Dekker, m.); *huckster*; *knitster* (*N.E.D.* only one example, 1648, of a man, and yet it is said: In form, feminine); *maltster*; *pitster*; *punster*; *rhymester*; *songster*; *speedster* (U.S. newspaper, 1926, not *N.E.D.*); *tapster*; *teamster*; *throwster*; *tipster*; *tonguester* (Tennyson, p. 438); *trickster*; *truckster* (truck farmer, U.S.); *whipster* (Swift, m.); *whitster* (Shakespeare, *Merry Wives*, III, iii, 14).

A word which is not usually mentioned in this connexion, but which should certainly be reckoned among these -ster words, is *barrister* (from 1547), derived from *bar*, 'the rest of the word is obscure' (*N.E.D.*). The only thing obscure in this word, which has never been applied to women, is the vowel *i* before the ending, which may be due to the desire to keep the consonantal quality of the *r* and to some vague association with *minister* and *solicitor* (earlier spellings are *barrester*, *barester*, *barraster*).

From adjectives we have *youngster* (chiefly of young men) and the rarer *oldster* (Thackeray, etc.); further *lewdster* (Shakespeare, *Merry Wives*, v, iii, 23 and from him in nineteenth century) and the recent American *shyster* 'lawyer who practises in an unprofessional manner.'

A recent formation is *roadster*, 'bicycle for ordinary roads, opposed to racer'—but that has nothing to do with sex.

Songster is found in Ælfric's *Grammar* in the way mentioned above ('Hic cantor *des sangere*, haec cantrix *þeos sangestre*'), but from the earliest occurrence in texts it is used of men: 1330 'He was þe best... Of iogelours & of sangestres'; 1497 'Henrj of Hadingtoun the sangester.' Now the word is generally kept distinct from *singer* by meaning 'writer of songs' or 'song-bird,' while *singer* is a man or woman who sings.

Like most of the words in -ster, *songster* is formed from a noun, while words in -er are now usually formed from the verb—and this really,

more than the imaginary sex-distinction, forms the chief difference between the two endings.

According to the usually received theory *spinster* is the only word in *-ster* that has kept the old value of the suffix. The old meaning of the word is 'one that spins,' and in that sense it may be used of a man, thus possibly in the oldest example in *N.E.D.*: 1362 'And my wyf at Westmunstre pat wollene cloþ made, Spak to the spinsters for to spinne hit softe.' In Shakespeare, *Henry VIII*, i, ii, 33, it is not yet a one-sex word: 'The clothiers...haue put off The spinsters, carders, fullers, weauers, who...are all in vprore.' But as spinning was chiefly done by women, it came to be a designation for women (chiefly if oldish and still unmarried), exactly as *milliner*, *leman*, and *witch* came to be used of women only.

If *-ster* is a two-sex ending it is easy to understand that special feminines have been formed from such words: *huckstress*, *seamstress* (*sempstress*), *songstress*, *spinstress*, the last word meaning both 'a female spinner' and 'a maiden lady.'

So far I have considered the English occurrence of the *-ster* ending only. Nothing is known of the origin of the ending, and it does not seem to have any connexion with any feminine ending in any of the related languages.

Edw. Schröder (*Die nomina agentis auf -ster*, in *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Niederdeutsche Sprachforschung*, 1922, pp. 1 ff.) has an etymological explanation which seems to me rather fanciful: the use of the suffix began with *mīltestre* 'prostitute,' which is a loan from the Lat. *meretrix* through *meletrix* and a supposed form **meletristia*. From *mīltestre* the ending was first transferred to other connected feminine occupations ('im offizierskasino'), *bepæcestre* 'harlot,' *hearpestre*, *fīþelestre*; in course of time these occupations, which were at first reserved for low women, chiefly slaves, came to be more respected, and after some of them had come to be exercised by men, nothing could hinder the transference of the ending to words for males. The whole line of thought is socially and linguistically impossible. The change of *meretrix* to *mīltestre* is difficult to understand except under the supposition that the suffix was already in existence when the word was transformed. If no suffix of that kind existed previously, the word *mīltestre* would not be felt to be a derived word (what is *mīlt*-?) and thus could not easily be taken as a starting-point for new formations (while this was easy enough in the case of Fr. *-esse*, where *prince* and *princesse* and other similar pairs were adopted into the language). Besides, a loan-word meaning 'prostitute' was

hardly the kind of word from which a mass-production of analogical words would spring up to denote women (and men) occupied in a more decent way¹.

Apart from this unfortunate etymology Schröder's article is valuable, because it gives a full account of the use of the suffix outside of England, in Dutch and in one part of the Low German district. Schröder has not the slightest doubt of the correctness of the usual theory of *-ster* as originally a specifically feminine ending, but many of the facts conscientiously recorded by him have confirmed me in the view I had formed long before the appearance of his article and have explained above.

In the first place, continental *-ster* words are in many places used of men; in Mark Brandenburg we have thus a whole series of words: *bingster*, *bökster*, *härkster*, *mähster*, besides recent formations like *knullenbuddelster*, but the only word there exclusively used of women is *spinster*. Secondly, we find extremely often the addition after *-ster* of some specifically feminine ending exactly as in E. *seamstress*. Thus in Flemish we find by the side of words like *bidster*, *naeyster*, *spinster* the extended forms *bidstrige*, *naeystrige*, *spinstrige*; in the same way Middle Low German has brushed up (*aufgefrischt*) the female character of the ending by adding the female suffixes *-in(ne)* or *-(es)se*, *-sche*: *biddesterinne*, *neisterinne*, *spinsterinne*, and *bidderstersche*, *neistersche*, *spinstersche*, *bindestersche*: according to Schröder this new feminine-formation (*movierung*) was not at all necessary: it is easy to understand from my point of view. In the same way we have in Middle Dutch *bidsterige*, *diensterse*, *spinsterige*, *voestrigge* or *voesterse*, etc., with secondary additions by the side of *bidster*, *dienster*, *spinster*, *voester*. In Modern Dutch—and only there—*-ster* is exclusively used of women; this Schröder considers a survival of the old rule (*trotz seiner verhältnismässig jungen überlieferung*): I am inclined in the late occurrence to see an indication of a change from the old state, a specialisation, which may seem strange, but is after all more natural than the use of a specifically feminine suffix to denote specifically masculine occupations, as in M.E. *deemster* and N.Fries. *grewster*, *grave-digger* (the last I take from *N.E.D.*).

OTTO JESPERSEN.

COPENHAGEN.

¹ If we have to think of one solitary Latin loan-word as the starting-point, it would be more pleasant to think of *magister* (*mæ-*), which is often found in that form (pl. *-stras*), once acc. *-stre*. But even that is hardly the source of our suffix.

HENRY CRABB ROBINSON'S 'ESSAY ON BLAKE'

READERS of Crabb Robinson's diary, whether in Sadler's edition or in the valuable selections published by Professor Edith Morley in 1922, will be aware of the fact that Robinson was a keen student of Blake, and in his eagerness to make his work known abroad wrote an essay on him for a German periodical. As it is one of the earliest attempts at an appreciation of Blake and almost certainly the first to appear in any foreign tongue, this study is of unusual interest and deserves more detailed consideration than it has hitherto received. Robinson's own account of the circumstances which led to his writing the essay is given in his *Reminiscences of Blake* under the year 1810. He says:

I was amusing myself this Spring by writing an account of the insane poet & painter engraver, *Blake*. Perthes of Hamburg had written to me asking me to send him an article for a new German Magazine entitled *Vaterländische Annalen* wh. he was abt to set up. And Dr. Malkin having in the memoirs of his son given an acct of this extraordinary genius with Specimens of his poems, I resolved out of these to compile a paper. And this I did, & the paper was translated by Dr. Julius, who many years afterwards introduced himself to me as my translator. It appears in the single number of the 2d. vol. of the *Vaterländische Annalen*. For it was at this time that Buonaparte united Hamburg to the French Empire, on wh. Perthes manfully gave up the Magazine, saying, as he had no longer a Vaterland, there cd. be no *Vaterländische Annalen*. But before I drew up this paper, I went to see a Gallery of Blake's paintings, wh. were exhibited by his brother, a hosier in Carnaby Market; the entrance was 2/6, catalogue included. I was deeply interested by the Catalogue as well as by the pictures. I took 4, telling the brother I hoped he wd. let me come in again. He said, 'Oh! as often as you please.' I dare say such a thing had never happened before or did afterwards¹.

The name of the periodical was not *Vaterländische Annalen* but *Vaterländisches Museum*. Possibly Perthes in writing to Robinson had given the former as the name of his projected review and afterwards altered the name. The essay was printed in Band II, Heft 1, S. 107-131. As Robinson says, after this number the activities of the periodical were interrupted. Immediately following his article appears a statement by Friedrich Perthes, dated 1 January 1811, that on account of the occupation of Hamburg by the French, publication would be suspended. The list of contents also gives the date as January 1811. In his edition of Blake (1905) Mr John Sampson correctly reproduces this date on pp. 86 and 96, but on pp. 115 and 127 it is incorrectly stated to be 1806. This error has also crept into Professor Elton's *Survey of English Literature*, 1780-1830, I, p. 432 note.

¹ *Selections from the Remains of H. C. Robinson*, ed. Edith J. Morley, 1922, p. 17.

The Perthes family is well known, but it may perhaps not be amiss to say something of Robinson's translator, Dr Julius. He was born at Altona on 3 October 1783, the only son of Jewish parents, the father being a wealthy banker and army contractor. Having abandoned the idea of a business career, Julius began the study of medicine at Heidelberg in 1805 and continued his work at Würzburg in the autumn of 1808, where he took his doctor's degree in the following February. On 22 May 1809 he embraced the Catholic faith and received the names of Nicolaus Heinrich. A student at the German universities in the days of the Napoleonic conquest could not fail to be profoundly stirred by the patriotic movement which was sweeping over Germany. Julius was influenced as much as anyone. After his return to Hamburg, where he began to practise as a doctor, he joined Perthes in editing the *Vaterländisches Museum*. He also published a song-book which was dedicated to the Hanseatic Legion and contained many songs by himself. Julius took an active part in the wars of liberation and did good service as a military doctor. After the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo, Julius returned to Hamburg and resumed his ordinary life. He now found more leisure for his literary and medical studies. In 1817 he published the *Bibliotheca germano-glottica*, a work dealing with Germanic antiquities, and along with a colleague edited the *Magazin der ausländischen Litteratur der gesamten Heilkunde*. In the execution of his medical duties, Julius turned his attention to the state of German prisons and determined to bring about reforms. To prepare himself for this task he undertook a journey through the chief countries of Europe, selling a portion of his library to enable him to do so. As a result of his investigation of foreign prisons, in 1827 he published an appeal to women, *Die weibliche Fürsorge für Gefangene und Kranke ihres Geschlechts*, which was largely based on the writings of Elizabeth Fry. Partly through the work of Julius and partly through that of his sister, the ideas of this noble Englishwoman were destined to exert a far-reaching influence on the Continent. In 1827 Julius also delivered a series of lectures on prison reform and these he expanded and published the following year. These *Vorlesungen über Gefängnissskunde oder über Verbesserung der Gefängnisse und sittliche Verbesserung der gefangenen und entlassenen Sträflinge*, along with other writings on the same subject by Julius aroused great attention in France as well as in Germany. The then Crown Prince of Prussia was warmly interested in these new ideas and gave Julius every encouragement. He became a well-known figure in the literary and scientific circles of Berlin. His *Jahrbücher der Straf- und Besserungs-*

anstalten, his *Jahrbücher der Gefängnissskunde* and his *Nordamerikas sittliche Zustände*, the fruits of a lengthy visit to the United States, all added to his reputation. In 1840 King Frederick William IV entrusted him with the drawing up of proposals for the reform of the Prussian prisons but his suggestions, in spite of the King's support, remained largely inoperative, owing to the passive resistance of the bureaucrats in the Ministries concerned. After the political troubles of 1848 Julius retired to Hamburg. Monetary rewards never came his way and in his old age he had to sell the remainder of his library, but many societies, at home and abroad, recognised the distinguished services of this warm-hearted, self-sacrificing lover of humanity¹.

It was this versatile and gifted man who translated Robinson's essay. The translation, although it takes an occasional liberty with the quotations, is excellent. His renderings of the poems by Blake that Robinson cites are well done. Especially is this true of 'Piping down the valleys wild' and 'The Tiger,' where he is remarkably successful in catching the rhythmic effect of the original.

At the time when Robinson wrote he had not yet made the acquaintance of Blake and consequently we have in the essay no such shrewd personal observations of the poet as he noted down in later years. It is evident, however, that he was attracted by this strange genius and made an honest attempt to understand the mystic who differed so greatly from his own eminently sane and cool-headed self. To Robinson Blake was a singular phenomenon and though the poet's way of thinking at times passed his comprehension, he sought to familiarise himself with all that he had painted or written. In the essay he speaks of Blake's illustrations to children's books, to Young's *Night Thoughts* and to Blair's *Grave*, not with the vague remoteness of a superficial dilettante but with the accurate comment of one who knew them well. The same holds good of his remarks on *Poetical Sketches* and *Songs of Innocence and of Experience*, on *Europe* and *America*. He describes in detail not merely the contents

¹ See *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, xiv, pp. 686-9. It is of interest to add that the State and University Library of Hamburg possesses a book formerly belonging to Julius in which the following entry is found:

The mad genius of
Blake:
The philanthropy of
Bettina v. Arnim
The passionless wisdom of
Goethe
To Dr Julius

Memoriæ Causæ
scripsit
18th July 1834

H. C. Robinson
Plowden Buildings
Temple
London

of these books, but their appearance and the unusual processes applied in their production. No doubt he is puzzled like one who has strayed into a weird and unknown world, but at least he talks with intimate knowledge. Moreover, Robinson had learned what he could about Blake from the few sources then available. He gleaned a few biographical details from Dr Malkin's account in *A Father's Memoir of his Child* and also read with profit Fuseli's introduction to the 1808 edition of Blair's *Grave*. But above all it was the *Catalogue of the Exhibition of Blake's pictures* which was a mine of information about the principles on which the poet-engraver acted. Something Robinson had also heard by word of mouth and in particular our attention is attracted by the story that he tells to illustrate Blake's belief in visions. According to this account Blake told a friend, who afterwards informed Robinson, that on one occasion he was carrying a picture which he had painted for a lady of rank and, growing tired, he entered an inn to rest. Thereupon the angel Gabriel appeared and touched him on the shoulder, saying: 'Blake, why tarriest thou here? Go, thou shalt not grow weary.' And he went on his way without weariness.

Robinson regards Blake as an extraordinary man, a combination of genius and madness, demanding esteem because of his abilities and pity by reason of his claim to be gifted with supernatural powers. He evidently finds something to admire in Blake's defiance of accepted doctrines in art and in the courage and steadfastness with which he pursued his own course in spite of poverty and the derision of critics. Robinson perceives quite rightly that Blake's confidence and firmness of purpose were due to his faith in supernatural guidance. Hence the blank negation with which Blake met his opponents. Robinson sympathises with Blake's indignation when Schiavonetti was allowed to engrave the designs for Blair's *Grave* in a manner contrary to their author's most cherished artistic beliefs. But at the same time he views Blake with a critical eye. He clearly rejects his fixed ideas on the infamy of oil-painting and disapproves of his sweeping condemnation of the Dutch and Venetian masters. He also notes the incoherent arrangement of the *Catalogue* and the frequent ambiguity and obscurity of Blake's work. So much so that he generally prefers to let Blake explain his own views or to quote the appreciation of some authority like Fuseli. More than once Robinson confesses his inability to interpret Blake's intention. Thus he says that in spite of his having seen the allegorical pictures of Pitt guiding Behemoth and Nelson Leviathan, he does not venture to describe them. Evidently Robinson is ill at ease in the presence of the

'spiritual forms' of his great contemporaries. It is perhaps in speaking of the illustrations to Young's *Night Thoughts* that he expresses his own opinions of Blake's designs most fully, and incidentally he gives us some valuable details concerning them. He tells us that although only thirteen years had elapsed since the publication of the work, it had already disappeared from the bookshops and become extremely rare. Robinson had also heard that the publisher had withheld from the public three-quarters of the drawings made by Blake for this subject and had likewise refused to sell them, even though offered a considerable sum. As for those published, Robinson finds them of unequal value. 'At times the inventions of the artist vie with those of the poet; often, however, they are merely an absurd translation of them, through the unhappy idea, peculiar to Blake, that everything with which the imagination dazzles the spiritual eye, flashing back, must be given to the bodily eye to be tasted (*sic*). Thus Young is literally translated and his poem transformed into a picture.' Of the works that Robinson saw at the exhibition he thought 'The Ancient Britons' the greatest and the best finished and that of Chaucer's pilgrims the best executed. It was in his opinion fortunate that in the latter work by the very nature of the subject Blake's wild imagination was held in check. He therefore expressed a wish that the engraving of this picture, for which the names of subscribers had been solicited, might be carried out.

In his essay Robinson also comments on Blake's religious views. He says that at times his position seems to be that of the orthodox Christian but on the other hand his attitude towards ancient mythology, as expressed in the *Catalogue*, appears distinctly unorthodox. On occasion Blake speaks like a zealous monotheist denouncing idolatry and yet his statement that 'the antiquities of every Nation under Heaven, is no less sacred than that of the Jews' savours of the tolerance and indifference of paganism rather than of the essential strictness of Christianity. Robinson mentions Blake's admiration for Swedenborg but points out that he refused to join the Swedenborgians under Proud. He is therefore driven to the conclusion that Blake was not a regular devotee of any Church and that in religion, as in everything else, he was a law unto himself.

The latter part of Robinson's study is concerned with Blake's poetry. In the first place it deals with the *Poetical Sketches* and here it must be admitted that Robinson does scant justice to the excellence of some of these early poems. After his customary remark as to their inequality, he continues: 'The structure of the verse is for the most part so loose

and negligent that it displays a complete ignorance of art and at the same time most of the pieces are of outrageous crudeness and very repellent.' Robinson's ear was evidently not attuned to the fresh cadence of Blake's lyric measures. Nor is anyone nowadays likely to join in the lavish praise that he bestows on the dramatic fragments in this volume, which he considers to display 'a wildness and grandeur of imagination that bear witness to genuine poetic feeling.' His judgment is, however, not altogether at fault, for as an illustration of Blake's powers at this stage he chooses the poem 'To the Muses.' Passing to the *Songs of Innocence and of Experience*, he again finds a strange mixture of good and bad. Some of the poems in the earlier book he describes as 'childlike songs of great beauty and simplicity,' while others seem to him extremely childish. He is more puzzled by the *Songs of Experience*, 'metaphysical riddles and mystical allegories,' which, though they contain pictures of the greatest beauty and sublimity, are full of poetic fancies that could be intelligible only to the initiated. Robinson shows his insight by the poems that he quotes—first, the introductory 'Piping down the valleys wild' and 'Holy Thursday' and then as a contrast to this 'tender and simple poem' the 'truly singular and sublime description' of 'The Tiger¹.' Of the allegorical songs he cites 'The Garden of Love,' because he thinks that he understands it, whereas others are 'completely incomprehensible.' Perplexed as Robinson is by some of these allegories, he is still more bewildered by *America* and *Europe* and confesses himself incapable of giving an account of them. He finds their form as baffling as their meaning. *Europe* he calls a 'mysterious, unintelligible rhapsody' which 'seems to be in verse.' Before bringing his essay to a close Robinson comments on the fact that in 1810 Blake's poems were but little known, apparently even less than his paintings and engravings. 'These prophecies,' he says, 'like the songs, do not seem to have come to the knowledge of the general public.'

Summing up, Robinson declares that Blake indisputably possesses all the elements of greatness, though in unequal proportions. He suggests that in art he will perhaps never create perfect and immortal work nor in poetry flawless masterpieces, but for all that he considers that Blake well repays attention. Amid all his wildness and extravagance Robinson notes occasional flashes of reason. In this connexion he makes a remark which has its interest. In Blake's *Catalogue*, he says, 'one

¹ Malkin had also quoted 'Holy Thursday' and 'The Tiger' but in spite of Robinson's modesty in his *Reminiscences*, his selection is independent of Malkin.

finds many expressions which one would rather have expected from a German than an Englishman,' and in the concluding lines of his essay he insists that the personality of Blake is likely to make a greater appeal to the German than to the English people. Robinson probably had in mind not the innate leaning of the German towards metaphysical speculation but rather the different character of English and German literature at the time when he was writing. It does not appear, however, that Robinson's essay gave any particular stimulus to the study of Blake in Germany. The young painter Götzenberger who called on Robinson in 1827, when the diarist took him to see Blake and acted as interpreter between them, may have had his curiosity aroused in this way. But the essay had no widespread influence. Perhaps its publication at a time when Germany was in a ferment of patriotic emotion and political agitation accounts for its passing unnoticed. The sweet melodies of Blake were lost in the hoarse roar of cannon.

We append Robinson's article, as printed in the *Vaterländisches Museum*. Footnotes have been added, explaining a few allusions or showing the sources of his information. References are to the edition of Blake published by the Nonesuch Press in 1925.

WILLIAM BLAKE

KÜNSTLER, DICHTER UND RELIGIÖSER SCHWÄRMER

The lunatic, the lover and the poet,
Are of imagination all compact.

SHAKESPEARE.

UNTER allen den Gegenständen, welche den philosophischen Seelenforscher zu reizen vermögen, giebt es gewiß keinen anlockenderen, als die Vereinigung von Genie und Wahnwitz in einzelnen merkwürdigen Gemüthern, welche, indem sie auf der einen Seite unsere Hochachtung durch ausgezeichnete Geistesfähigkeiten erzwingen, auf der anderen durch Ansprüche auf übernatürliche Kräfte wieder unser Mitleiden erregen. Von dieser Art ist nun das ganze Geschlecht von Verzückten, Mystikern, Sehern von Gesichtern und Träumern von Träumen, deren Verzeichniß wir einen neuen Namen, William Blake, beyzufügen haben.

Dieser außerordentliche Mensch, welcher gegenwärtig in London lebt, beginnt, obgleich schon mehr als fünfzig Jahre alt, erst jetzt aus der Dunkelheit hervorzutreten, auf welche ihn die seltsame Richtung seiner Talente, und das Wunderliche seines persönlichen Charakters beschränkt hatten. Wir wissen zu wenig von seiner Geschichte, um Anspruch auf eine vollständige Beschreibung seines Lebens zu machen, zu der wir nur aus sehr neuen Quellen Belege schöpfen konnten. Vorläufig genüge uns, zu wissen, daß er, zu London von nicht sehr wohlhabenden Eltern geboren, früh seiner eigenen Leitung oder Mißleitung überlassen ward. Im zehnten Jahre kam er in eine Zeichenschule, im vierzehnten zu einem Kupferstecher, Namens Basire, der vorzüglich durch Stuarts Beschreibung von Athen, und durch West's Orestes und Pylades bekannt ist. Schon als Knabe zeichnete sich Blake durch die Sonderbarkeit seines

Geschmacks aus. Leidenschaftlich für die gothische Baukunst eingenommen, brachte er Tage lang damit zu, die Denkmäler der Westminster-Abtey abzuzeichnen. Nebenher sammelte er Kupferstiche, vorzüglich nach Raphael und Michel Angelo, und vergötterte Albrecht Dürer und Heemskerck.

Obgleich er nachher auf der königlichen Akademie studirte, hatte er seine Richtung doch schon einmal auf eine so eigene Art genommen, daß er, von seinen Mitschülern isolirt, aller gewöhnlichen, regelmäßigen Beschäftigung entwöhnt ward. Man findet deßhalb seinen Namen nur unter sehr geringen Platten zu Kinderbüchern; indem er aber Ansichten von der Kunst hegte, die dem Geschmack der Kunstbeschützer völlig entgegen standen, und die neueren Moden sowohl im Zeichnen als Kupferstechen als Versündigungen an der Kunst betrachtete, zog er nach seinem eigenen Ausdrucke vor, lieber ein 'Martyrer' seiner Religion, d.h. seiner Kunst zu werden, als seine Talente durch eine feige Nachgiebigkeit gegen die Ausübung der Kunst, in einem verderbten Zeitalter derselben, herabzuwürdigen. Da nun außerdem seine religiösen Überzeugungen ihm den Ruf eines vollendeten Tollhäuslers zuwege gebracht hatten, bleibt es kaum zu verwundern, daß, während Kenner von Profession nichts von ihm wissen, selbst seine Gönner nicht umhin können, neben ihrer Bewunderung für ihn, auch ihr Mitleiden zu äußern. In der That gelang bis jetzt erst ein Versuch, ihn bey dem größten britischen Publikum einzuführen, durch seine Zeichnungen zu Blair's Grab, einem bey ernsten Gemüthern sehr beliebten, religiösen Gedicht, welches die Kunstrichter, in Betracht seiner Schönheiten und Auswüchse, gleich merkwürdig finden, und wegen des Mangels an Geschmack und Zartheit tadeln, während sie die Kraft und Erfindungsgabe des Dichters bewundern¹. Man trug Blake, obgleich er eigentlich Kupferstecher war, dennoch nicht den Stich seiner eigenen Zeichnungen auf, sondern Schiavonetti mußte dieselben aus Gründen, die wir bald hören werden, ausführen, was er auch mit großer Sauberkeit, aber mit einer solchen Beymischung von Pünktchen und Linien that, daß es den Zeichner empören mußte. Dieses Werk, welches aus zwölf Zeichnungen von Blake, einem vortrefflichen Kopfe von ihm, und dem Originaltexte besteht, kostet zwey und eine halbe Guinee. Voran gehen einige Bemerkungen von Füßli², welche wir hier als ein Zeugniß für das Verdienst unsers Künstlers einrücken, da wir eine unmittelbare Anschauung seiner Werke nicht zu liefern vermögen. Füßli sagt, nachdem er vom sittlichen Nutzen einer Reihe so ernster Zeichnungen in einem so leichtfertigen Zeitalter als das unsrige, wo die Allegorien des Alterthums verbraucht und erschöpft sind, gesprochen hat, 'der Künstler versucht, unser Gemüth zu bewegen, indem er unsere Gefühle durch weniger willkührliche und zweydeutige Bilder erregte, als diejenigen sind, welche Mythologie, Aberglaube und Symbolik der älteren und neueren Zeit, so weit hergeholt oder unzweckmäßig, uns darzubieten vermögen.' 'In Betreff der eigentlichen Ausführung der Zeichnungen,' setzt er hinzu, 'verdient der Künstler, wenn er gleich nach andern Grundsätzen beurtheilt, und auf eine kleinere Zahl von Verehrern beschränkt seyn will, gleichen Beyfall. Es erregt oft unser Staunen, öfter noch unsere Besorgniß, wenn wir ihn kühn an der Grenze erlaubter Erfindung scherzen sehen; allein, welcher Künstler möchte eine so mahlerische Wildheit vermissen wollen, die wieder so oft durch Geschmack, Einfachheit und Vollendung aufgewogen wird? Die Gruppen und einzelnen Gestalten bieten, für sich allein betrachtet, abgezogen von der Zusammensetzung des Ganzen und ohne Rücksicht auf den Plan des Ganzen, oft jene wahren und ungezierten Stellungen, jene anmuthige Einfalt dar, welche nur Natur und Gemüth hervorzubringen, nur ein von beyden geleitetes Auge zu entdecken vermag. Jeder Künstler, er beschäftige sich mit welchem Zweige der Kunst er wolle, stehe, auf welcher Stufe der Vervollkommnung er wolle, vom Lehrlinge bis zum Meister, vom Zierrathler bis zum Geschichtenmaler, er wird hier immer Stoff zum Lernen, und Winke und Ideen zur ferneren Ausbildung finden³.' Man sieht, daß dieses

¹ In speaking of Blake's critics, Robinson must have had in mind the strictures in *The Examiner* on the occasion of the publication of the 1808 edition of Blair's *Grave* and of the exhibition of Blake's pictures in 1809.

² The translation naturally gives the original German form of the name, not the anglicised Fuseli.

³ See Robert Blair, *The Grave*, London, 1808, Introduction, pp. xiii-xiv.

‘kein Verdammn durch verstelltes Lob’ sey, denn nur zu deutlich ist der Tadel, welchen der Künstler zu befahren hat, ausgedrückt. Die Wahrheit ist, daß von allen Zeichnern, welche je lebten, auch nicht einer die von Göthe in seinem ergötzlichen ‘Sammler und die Seinigen’ (S. Propyläen B. 2, St. 2) unter der Benennung von Poetisirenn, Phantomisten usw. geschilderten Einseitigkeiten, so genau an sich darstellte, als unser Künstler.

Wir werden noch zu diesen Zeichnungen zurückkommen, und wollen jetzt von dem kleinen Buche reden, aus welchem wir vorzüglich diese Nachrichten geschöpft haben, und welches gewiß eins der sonderbarsten ist, die je erschienen.

Die Zeichnungen zum Grabe, wenn gleich vielleicht nur von wenigen bewundert, wurden grade von diesen laut und übermäßig gepriesen. Blake, der durch sie bekannt wurde, beschloß nun, ohne Scheu öffentlich hervorzutreten. Er eröffnete daher voriges Jahr eine Ausstellung seiner Freskogemähle, und kündigte an, daß er die verlorne Kunst der Freskomahlerey wieder erfunden habe. Er forderte diejenigen, welche angenommen hatten, seine Werke seyen ohne Wissen und ohne Ebenmaaß, Sudeleyen eines Tollhüslers, auf, sie jetzt genauer zu untersuchen. ‘Sie würden finden,’ fügte er hinzu, ‘daß, wenn Italien durch Rafael reich und groß geworden, ‘wenn Michel Angelo sein höchster Ruhm, wenn die Kunst der Stolz der Nation ‘geworden wäre, wenn die menschliche Gesellschaft aus Genie und Begeisterung ‘hervorgegangen, auch durch sie verbunden bliebe, daß dann sein Vaterland bey der ‘Auszeichnung, welche seine Werke von denjenigen, welche es am besten verständen, ‘erhielten, die Ausstellung derselben als eine der heiligsten Pflichten von ihm forderte’¹.

Zu gleicher Zeit gab er ein beschreibendes Verzeichniß dieser Freskogemähle heraus, aus dem wir, da es in einem durchgängigen Mischmasch, ohne Plan und Ordnung, von abgerissenen Bemerkungen über Kunst und Religion besteht, und da die Besonderheiten des Verfassers am besten daraus hervorgehn, gleiche nur lose verbundene Auszüge liefern wollen.

Zu den fixen Ideen des Verf. gehört die Heftigkeit, mit welcher er durch das ganze Buch gegen die Oelmahlerey und gegen die Künstler aus den venetianischen und niederländischen Schulen loszieht. Seine Vorrede fängt mit folgenden Worten an: ‘Das Auge, welches im Stande ist, Rubens und Titians Colorit dem des Rafael und ‘Michel Angelo vorzuziehn, sollte bescheiden seyn, und seinem eigenen Urtheil ‘mißtrauen’². Dieß ist indeß nur noch ein leichter Tadel, und wie er in seinen Beschreibungen fortfährt, wächst seine Wuth gegen die falschen Mahlerschulen, und er klagt im heiligen Eifer die verhaßten Künstler als böse Geister, und die neuere Kunst als eine Geburt der Hölle an. Helldunkel nennt er schlechtweg ‘ein höllisches Werkzeug ‘in der Hand venetianischer und niederländischer Teufel’³. Aus dem Folgenden geht hervor, daß diese Ausdrücke nicht bloß als rednerische Wendungen zu nehmen sind. So nennt er Correggio ‘einen weichlichen, weibischen, und daher höchst grausamen ‘Teufel’⁴. Rubens ist ‘ein gewaltthätiger, hochfahrender Teufel’⁵. Diese Künstler sind nebst Titian und Rembrandt die immerwährenden Gegenstände seines Tadels, und zum Schluß sagt er: ‘bis wir uns ihrer entledigen, werden wir nie Rafael und ‘Albrecht Dürer, Michel Angelo und Giulio Romano beykommen’⁶. Er verbirgt den Grund dieses Vorzuges nicht, und die folgende Stelle enthält, indem sie uns die Ansicht des Künstlers über das Mechanische seiner Kunst eröffnet, eine Wahrheit, die nicht abgeleugnet werden kann, und die seiner ganzen Lehre zum Grunde liegt. ‘Die große und goldene Regel der Kunst, wie des Lebens, ist, daß, je bestimmter, ‘schärfer und genauer die umgränzende Linie ist, desto vollkommener auch das ‘Kunstwerk, und je weniger scharf und schneidend jene, desto größer die Gewißheit ‘schwacher Nachahmung, Diebstahls und Puscherey. Zu allen Zeiten wußten dieß ‘große Erfinder. Protogenes und Apelles erkannten sich an dieser Linie. Rafael und ‘Michel Angelo und Albrecht Dürer sind durch sie und durch sie allein bekannt. Der ‘Mangel an dieser bestimmten und begränzenden Form, beweist den Mangel des ‘Künstlers an Ideen, und die durchgängige Unverschämtheit und Anmaaßung des ‘Diebes. Wodurch unterscheiden wir die Eiche von der Buche, das Pferd vom

¹ Advertisement to the *Catalogue of Blake's Exhibition*, III, p. 90.

² *Catalogue*, III, p. 91.

³ *Ibid.*, III, p. 115.

⁴ *Ibid.*, III, p. 116.

⁵ *Ibid.*, III, p. 118.

⁶ *Ibid.*, III, p. 92.

'Ochsen, als durch die begränzende Linie und durch ihre unendlich mannichfaltigen 'Biegungen und Bewegungen? Was baut denn ein Haus und pflanzt einen Garten, 'als das Bestimmte und Festgesetzte? Was unterscheidet Ehrlichkeit von Büberey, 'als die harte und scharfe Linie des Richtmaaßes und der Zuverlässigkeit in Hand- 'lungen und Gesinnungen? Nehmt diese Linie weg, und ihr nehmt das Leben selbst, 'alles ist wieder Chaos, und der Allmächtige muß wieder in demselben die Linie 'vorziehn, ehe Mensch oder Thier nur daseyn können. Redet daher nicht mehr von 'Correggio oder Rembrandt, oder irgend einem jener Diebe aus Venedig und Flandern. 'Sie waren nur die lahmen Nachahmer der von ihren Vorgängern ihnen vorgezogenen 'Linien¹. Diese Stelle reicht hin, um zu erklären, warum man unserm Künstler nicht erlaubte, seine eigenen Zeichnungen zu stechen. In demselben Geiste leugnet er die Gültigkeit der neuern Unterscheidung zwischen einem Gemälde und einer Zeichnung. 'Wenn das Wesen eines Gemäldes im Verwischen und Verliehren der Außenlinie 'besteht, so wird Blake nie so thöricht seyn, eins zu machen².—Raphaels Freskoge- 'mälde waren bloß mehr ausgeführt als seine Cartons³. Er spricht Titian, Rubens und Correggio alles Verdienst im Colorit ab, und sagt: 'ihre Männer sind wie Leder 'und ihre Frauen wie Kreide⁴. In seinem Hauptgemälde sind die nackten Gestalten fast purpurroth. Es sind alte Britten, von denen er sagt: 'Das Uebermaaß von 'Gesundheit im Fleisch, was der freyen Luft ausgesetzt, durch die Geister der Wälder 'und Wellen in jener alten glücklichen Zeit genährt wurde, kann nicht den krank- 'haften Tinten des Titian und Rubens gleichen. Ein Mensch aus unsrer Zeit, seiner 'Kleiderbürde entledigt, gleicht einem todten Leichnam⁵.

Wir gehen jetzt vom mechanischen Theile der Kunst zur Erfindung und zum poetischen Theile, wo die Eigenheiten unseres Künstlers noch auffallender hervortreten, über. Sein größter Genuß besteht in der Verkörperung geistiger Wesen. So hat er in seinem Grabe Geist und Körper zu wiederholtenmalen getrennt dargestellt, und beyden bey gleicher Stärke der Umrisse, auch gleiche Masse gegeben. In einer seiner besten Zeichnungen 'der Tod des starken und bösen Menschen,' liegt der Körper im Todeskampf körperlicher Leiden, und ein zerbrochenes Gefäß, dessen Inhalt ausfließt, deutet den Augenblick des Todes an, während die Seele in eine Flamme gehüllt, vom Kopfküssen aufsteigt. Diese ist zugleich eine Nachbildung des Leichnams, wenn gleich in veränderter Stellung, mit dem gut getroffenen Ausdrucke des Schreckens aus dem Fenster fliehend. In andern gestochenen Zeichnungen erscheint die Seele über dem Leichnam schwebend, den sie nur ungern verläßt, in andern die Wiedervereinigung beyder bey der Auferstehung usw. Dies sind ungefähr seine anstößigsten Erfindungen.

In seinem Verzeichnisse finden wir noch folgende Rechtfertigung gegen die seinem frühern Werke gemachten Einwürfe. 'Soll die Mahlerey bloß auf schmutzige, sterb- 'liche und verderbliche Gegenstände eingeschränkt bleiben, soll sie sich nicht so gut 'wie Poesie und Tonkunst zu der ihr gebührenden Höhe der Erfindung und begeisterter 'Verzückung erheben⁶? Darauf beruft er sich auf die Bildsäulen der griechischen Gottheiten, als auf eben so viele körperliche Abbildungen geistiger Wesen. 'Ein 'Geist und eine Erscheinung sind nicht wie die neuere Philosophie annimmt, entweder 'ein nebelhaftes Gebilde oder gar nichts, sie sind vielmehr organische mit allem bis 'aufs kleinste versehene Wesen, von einer Vollkommenheit, wie sie gar keine sterbliche 'und vergängliche Natur hervorbringen kann. Wer sich nicht bedeutendere und 'schönere Lineamente in einer bedeutenderen und schöneren Beleuchtung als sein 'sterbliches Auge zu sehen vermag, denken kann, der denkt gar nicht. Der Maler des 'vorliegenden Werks behauptet daher, daß ihm all sein Gedachtes unendlich voll- 'kommener und feiner organisirt, als alles, was sein sterbliches Auge je sah, vorkomme. 'Geister sind organisirte Menschen?'

In gewissem Sinne wird jeder erfindende Künstler das nehmliche behaupten müssen, aber zweydeutig wird es immer bleiben, in welchem Sinne unser Künstler diese Ausdrücke gebraucht. Denn in seiner eigenen Beschreibung seiner allegorischen

¹ *Catalogue*, III, p. 119.

² *Ibid.*, III, pp. 118–119.

³ *Ibid.*, III, p. 118.

⁴ *Ibid.*, III, p. 113.

⁵ *Ibid.*, III, p. 113.

⁶ *Ibid.*, III, pp. 107–108.

⁷ *Ibid.*, III, p. 108.

Gemähle, wie Pitt den Behemoth und Nelson den Leviathan führt (Gemähle, welche Schreiber dieses, obgleich er sie gesehen hat, nicht zu beschreiben wagt), sagt er: diese Gemähle glichen den Vergötterungen, die man auf persischen, indischen und ägyptischen Alterthümern findet¹. Er setzt hinzu: 'Der Künstler, in einem 'Gesichte in jene alten Republiken, Monarchien und Patriarchate Asiens versetzt, 'sah die bewundernswürdigen Urbilder, welche die heilige Schrift Cherubim nennt, 'und welche sich an den Mauern der Tempel ausgehauen und gemahlt befanden, die 'in den sehr gebildeten Staaten von Aegypten, Moab, Edom, Aram, zwischen den 'Flüssen des Paradieses errichtet waren, Urbilder, welche die Griechen und Hetrusker 'im farnesischen Herkules und andern Bildsäulen nachahmten. Mit Ausnahme des 'Torso waren sie alle augenscheinlich Copien, denn die griechischen Musen als Töchter 'der Mnemosyne oder des Gedächtnisses, nicht aber der Begeisterung oder der Er- 'findung, konnten unmöglich so erhabene Ideen einflößen². Da diese Einbildung unseres Künstlers von seiner Gemeinschaft mit der geistigen Welt, deren wie Swedenborg zu genießen, er zu gestehen kein Bedenken trägt, mehr als irgend etwas anders seinem Rufe geschadet hat, so fügen wir noch eine merkwürdige Stelle aus seinem Verzeichnisse, dem Gesagten bey.

Sein größtes und vollendetstes Werk hat den Titel: Die alten Britten. Es gründet sich auf eines jener seltsamen Ueberbleibsel der alten Walisischen Dichtkunst, welches Owen unter dem Namen von Triaden, folgendermaßen giebt:

In der letzten Schlacht die Arthur focht, war der Schönste einer
Der wiederkehrte, und der Stärkste ein andrer: mit ihnen kehrte auch wieder
Der Häßlichste, und kein andrer kehrte wieder vom blutigen Felde.
Der Schönste, Rom's Krieger bebten vor ihm und dienten.
Der Stärkste, sie schmolzen vor ihm und zerstoben in seiner Nähe.
Der Häßlichste, sie flohen mit Geschrey und Verdrehung ihrer Glieder³.

Diese dunkle Rede hat folgenden noch dunkleren Commentar zu Wege gebracht. 'Der starke Mann stellt das Erhabene im Menschen vor, der schöne Mann das Leiden- 'schaftliche im Menschen, was in Eden's Kriegen in das Männliche und Weibliche 'getheilt erschien, der häßlichste Mann endlich die Vernunft im Menschen. Sie waren 'ursprünglich Ein Mensch, der vierfach war; dieser war in sich selbst getheilt, und sein 'eigentliches Menschseyn im Augenblicke der Zeugung vernichtet. Die Gestalt des 'vierten war aber wie der Sohn Gottes. Wie er aber getheilt wurde, ist ein Gegenstand 'von großer Erhabenheit und Leidenschaftlichkeit. Der Künstler hat es, wie ihm 'solches eingegeben worden, niedergeschrieben, und wird es mit göttlicher Hülfe 'bekannt machen. Es ist von großem Umfange, und enthält die alte Geschichte von 'Britannien und die Welt Adams und Satans⁴. Das Gemähle stellt diese drey Wesen im Kampfe mit den Römern begriffen vor, jedoch wollen wir lieber den Künstler selbst von seinem Werke reden lassen. 'Man hat zum Künstler gesagt, 'nimm das Modell zu deinem schönen Mann vom Apollo, zu deinem starken Mann 'vom Herkules, und zu deinem häßlichen Mann vom tanzenden Faun; aber hier muß 'er nun für sich selbst stehen. Er weiß daß, was er leistet, den größten Antiken nicht 'nachsteht, und daß diese nicht höher stehn können, denn menschliche Kraft vermag 'nicht, sich über das, was er und was sie geleistet haben, zu erheben. Es ist die Gabe 'Gottes, es ist Eingebung und Gesicht. Poesie, wie sie jetzt auf Erden in den ver- 'schiedensten Ueberresten alter Dichter lebt; Musik, wie sie in alten Lauten und 'Weisen webt; Mahlerey und Bildhauerey, wie sie sich noch im Nachlasse des Alter- 'thums zeigen, sind Eingebung und können nicht übertroffen werden. Sie sind 'vollkommen und ewig. Milton, Shakespear, Michel Angelo, Raphael, die schönsten 'Hervorbringungen alter Bildhauerey, Mahlerey und Baukunst, gothisch, griechisch, 'indisch und ägyptisch, sie sind das Aeußerste des menschlichen Geistes. Der 'menschliche Geist kann nicht weiter gehn als die Gabe Gottes, der heilige Geist⁵. 'Anderswo sagt er, daß Adam und Noah Druiden waren, und daß er selbst ein Be- 'wohner Edens sey⁶.

¹ Catalogue, III, p. 93.

² Advertisement to the Catalogue, III, p. 89.

³ Catalogue, III, p. 110.

⁴ Ibid., III, pp. 111–112.

⁵ Ibid., III, p. 94.

⁶ Ibid., III, p. 110.

Blake's religiöse Meynungen scheinen diejenigen eines rechtgläubigen Christen zu seyn, und dennoch kommen wieder Stellen über alte Mythologie vor, welche hierüber einigen Zweifel einflößen könnten. Diese Stellen finden sich in seiner Nachricht über sein Gemähde von Chaucer's Pilgrimmen vor, gewiß dem bestausgeführten seiner Werke, weil er, durch seinen Vorwurf gebunden, nicht auf eine zurückstoßende Art ausschweifen konnte. Wir wünschen daher den Stich desselben, wozu man Unterschriften gesammelt hat, ausgeführt zu sehn. Er bemerkt, 'jeder Charakter bey Chaucer ist eine antike Bildsäule, das Bild einer Gattung, nicht aber eines unvollkommenen Individuums¹.' Zugleich behauptet er, dieß seyen auch die Charaktere der griechischen Mythologie. 'Chaucer hat den alten Charakter des Herkules zwischen seinem Müller und Pflüger vertheilt. Der Pflüger ist Herkules in seinem höchsten ewigen Zustande, entkleidet von seinem gespensterartigen Schatten, welches der Müller ist, ein furchtbarer Kerl, wie es deren an allen Orten und zu allen Zeiten zur Zuchtruthe der Menschen giebt, die ganze Nachbarschaft erschreckend, durch brutale Stärke und Muth, reich und mächtig geworden, das Selbstgefühl der Menschen zu verhöhnen, während Menschenfreundlichkeit und Wohlwollen der Hauptzug im Charakter des Pflügers ist². Gesichte von diesen ewigen Grundzügen oder Charakteren des menschlichen Lebens, erscheinen den Dichtern zu allen Zeiten. Die griechischen Gottheiten waren die alten Cherubim Phöniciens, aber die Griechen, und nach ihnen die neuern versäumten die Götter des Priamus zu unterjochen. Diese Götter sind bloße Gesichte der Attribute des Ewigen, oder göttliche Namen. Erst als man sie zu Göttern erhob, wurden sie für die Menschheit verderblich. Sie sollten die Diener und nicht die Herren des Menschen oder der Gesellschaft seyn. Sie sollten genöthigt werden dem Menschen zu opfern, nicht aber der Mensch ihnen, denn getrennt vom Menschen oder der Menschheit, welches Jesus der Heiland, der Weinstock der Ewigkeit ist, sind die Diebe, Empörer und Verderber³.' Diese Stelle könnte erklärt werden, als die Sprache eines eifrigen Monotheisten gegen die Vielgötterey, indeß da unser Verfasser anderswo den Satz aufstellt: 'die Alterthümer jeder Nation seyen so heilig als die der Juden⁴,' so bleibt sein System dadurch wieder mehr der Gleichgültigkeit und Duldsamkeit des Heydenthums als der wesentlichen Strenge des Christenthums verwandt.

Dieß sind die ausschweifendsten und wildesten Stellen des Buchs, welche zu der Betrachtung führen, mit der wir diesen Bericht eröffneten. Man wird indeß zugleich nicht leugnen können, daß grade in jenen Auswüchsen Streiflichter von Vernunft und Geist hindurchblitzen, so wie sich überhaupt im ganzen Verzeichnisse eine Menge von Ausdrücken findet, die man eher von einem Deutschen als von einem Engländer erwartet hätte. Der protestantische Verfasser der 'Herzensergießungen eines kunstliebenden Klosterbruders⁵' schuf den Charakter eines Katholiken, in dem Religion und Kunstliebe zu einem Wesen verschmolzen waren, und dieser nehmliche Charakter kam, bewundernswürdig genug, im protestantischen England zum Vorschein. Jedoch gehört Blake nicht zur bischöflichen Kirche, sondern von Geburt zu einer dissidentirenden Gemeinde, obgleich wir nicht glauben, daß er sich regelmäßig zu irgend einer christlichen Kirche halte. Er wurde eingeladen, sich an die Swedenborgianer unter Proud anzuschließen, was er aber ausschlug, ungeachtet er eine große Meynung von Swedenborg hegt, und von ihm sagt: 'die Werke dieses Sehers sind alle der Aufmerksamkeit der Mahler und Dichter werth, sie enthalten den Grund zu großen Dingen. Der Grund, warum sie weniger beachtet worden sind, ist, weil fleischliche böse Geister das Uebergewicht erlangt haben⁶.' Unser Verfasser steht, wie Swedenborg, in Gemeinschaft mit den Engeln. Er erzählte jemand, aus dessen Munde wir es haben, daß, als er einst ein Gemähde, welches er für eine Dame von Stande verfertigt, nach Hause getragen, und sich dabey in einem Wirthshause habe ausruhen wollen, habe ihm der Engel Gabriel auf die Schulter geklopft und gesprochen: Blake, warum weilst Du hier? Geh zu, Du sollst nicht müde werden! Er sey darauf auch weiter gegangen, ohne zu ermüden. Eben dieses Vorrecht übernatürlicher Eingebung macht

¹ *Catalogue*, III, p. 101.² *Ibid.*, III, pp. 101–102.³ *Ibid.*, III, p. 101.⁴ *Ibid.*, III, p. 111.⁵ By W. H. Wackenroder, 1797.⁶ *Catalogue*, III, pp. 114–115.

ihn taub gegen die Stimme der Kunstrichter, denn er antwortet auf die gegen seine Werke gemachten Einwürfe, woran es natürlich nicht fehlen kann: 'ich weiß, daß 'es ist wie es seyn muß, denn es ist eine genaue Nachbildung dessen, was ich in einem 'Gesichte sah, und muß daher schön seyn.'

Es ist unnöthig, die Gegenstände von Blake's Hand aufzuzählen. Der vornehmsten haben wir schon erwähnt, und die übrigen sind entweder allegorisch, oder Werke der Feder. Wir müssen, ehe wir aufhören von ihm als Künstler zu reden, nur noch eines seiner Werke erwähnen. Dieß ist eine äußerst merkwürdige Ausgabe der ersten vier Bücher von Youngs Nachtgedanken, welche im Jahre 1797 in Folio erschien, und gar nicht mehr im Buchladen zu haben, so wie überhaupt äußerst selten geworden ist. In dieser Ausgabe steht der Text in der Mitte der Seite; auf den Seiten so wie oben und unten, Radirungen von Blake nach seinen eigenen Zeichnungen. Sie sind von sehr ungleichem Werthe: zuweilen wetteifern die Erfindungen des Künstlers mit denen des Dichters, oft sind sie aber nur eine widersinnige Uebersetzung derselben, durch die unglückseelige, Blake eigene Idee, daß alles, was die Phantasie dem geistigen Auge vorspiegelt, auch wiederleuchtend dem körperlichen zu schmecken gegeben werden müsse. So ist Young buchstäblich übersetzt, und sein Gedicht in ein Gemähde verwandelt worden. So stellt z. B. der Künstler in einer Zeichnung vor, wie der Tod Kronen mit Füßen tritt, die Sonne herablangt, usw. Dennoch sind diese Radirungen oft sehr ausgezeichnet. Wir hören, daß der Herausgeber noch nicht ein Viertel der ihm vom Künstler gelieferten Zeichnungen bekannt gemacht, und sich zugleich geweigert hat, die Handzeichnungen zu verkaufen, ungeachtet ihm eine ansehnliche Summe dafür geboten wurde.

Wir haben jetzt unsern Künstler als Dichter einzuführen, wobey wir zugleich einige Proben seiner Werke in diesem Zweige der Kunst geben werden, denn er selbst hat eigentlich nichts bekannt gemacht. Diese athmen einen gleichen Geist, und sind durch gleiche Eigenheiten ausgezeichnet, als seine Zeichnungen und seine kritische Prose. Schon im Jahre 1783 ward ein kleines Bändchen unter dem Titel: Poetische Versuche, gedruckt. (Poetical Sketches by W. B.) Auf dem Titel ist kein Drucker genannt, und in der Vorrede heißt es, daß die Gedichte zwischen dem 13ten und 20sten Jahre verfertigt wurden. Sie sind von sehr ungleichem Werthe. Der Versbau ist meistens so lose und sorglos, daß er eine völlige Unwissenheit der Kunst verräth, wobey zugleich die meisten Stücke von empörender Rohheit und sehr zurückstoßend sind. Dagegen findet sich auf der andern Seite in einigen dramatischen Bruchstücken wieder eine Wildheit und Größe der Phantasie, die ein ächt dichterisches Gefühl beglaubigen. Gegenwärtige Probe mag zum Maaßstabe der damaligen Vollendung des Dichters dienen.

'To the Muses.'

Whether on Ida's shady brow,
Or in the chambers of the East,
The Chambers of the Sun, that now
From ancient melody have ceased;

Whether in heaven ye wander fair,
Or the green corners of the Earth,
Or the blue regions of the air,
Where the melodious winds have birth;

Whether on chrystal rocks ye rove,
Beneath the bosom of the sea,
Wand'ring in many a coral grove;
Fair Nine forsaking Poetry!

How have you left the ancient love,
That bards of old enjoyed in you!
The languid strings do scarcely move,
The sound is forced, the notes are few.

'An die Musen.'

Weilt ihr auf des Ida Höh'n,
Oder auf des Ostens Thron,
Wo die Sonne pranget schön,
Stumm ist alter Lieder Ton?

Weilt ihr in des Himmels Luft,
Oder auf der Erde Grün,
Wo in blauer Töne Duft
Sich melodisch Winde ziehn?

Weilt ihr auf krystallnem Fels,
Tief im Busen grauer See'n,
Mög't ihr in der Perlen Schmelz
Durch Korallen-Grüfte gehn?

Wird alte Lieb' nicht mehr verspürt?
War't sonst für Bardendienst nicht kalt.
Die Harfe wird noch kaum gerührt,
Der Klang ist matt, der Ton verhallt.

Es giebt indessen ein noch merkwürdigeres Bändchen Gedichte unsers Verfassers, welches nur noch bey Sammlern angetroffen wird. Es ist in Duodez, und hat den Titel: 'Gesänge der Unschuld und Erfahrung, die beyden entgegengesetzten Zustände 'des menschlichen Gemüths erklärend, verfaßt und gedruckt von W. Blake.' (Songs of Innocence and of experience, shewing the two contrary states of the human soul. The Author and Printer W. Blake.) Die Buchstaben scheinen geätzt zu seyn, und der Abdruck ist in Gelb gemacht. Rund umher und zwischen den Zeilen finden sich alle Arten von Radirungen: zuweilen gleichen sie den ungestalten Hieroglyphen der Aegypter, zuweilen bilden sie wieder nicht unzierliche Arabesken. Wo sich nach dem Abdrucke noch ein leeres Plätzchen fand, ist ein Gemälde hineingekommen. Diese Miniaturgemälde sind von den lebhaftesten Farben, und oft grotesk, so daß das Buch ein äußerst seltsames Ansehen bekommen hat. Vom Text ist es nicht leicht, ein allgemeines Urtheil zu fällen, denn auf die Gedichte paßt jedes Lob und—jeder Tadel. Einige sind kindliche Lieder von großer Schönheit und Einfach: dieß sind die Gesänge der Unschuld, unter denen jedoch viele äußerst kindisch sind. Die Gesänge der Erfahrung sind hingegen metaphysische Räthsel und mystische Allegorien. Man findet unter ihnen poetische Gemälde von der höchsten Schönheit und Erhabenheit, und wieder dichterische Phantasieen, die bloß den Eingeweihten verständlich seyn können.

Da wir unsern Verfasser gern so bekannt als möglich machten, so wollen wir von jeder Art eine Probe geben. Das Buch hat eine Einleitung, von der wir hier die erste und die beyden letzten Strophen (die vierte und fünfte) einrücken.

Piping down the valleys wild,
Piping songs of pleasant glee,
On a cloud I saw a child,
And he laughing said to me:

'Piper, sit thee down and write
In a book that all may read.'
So he vanish'd from my sight,
And I pluck'd a hollow reed,

And I made a rural pen,
And I stained the water clear,
And I wrote my happy songs,
Every child may joy to hear.

Pfeifend ging ich durch das Thal,
 Pfeifend Lieder ohne Zahl;
 Sah ein Kind von Luft getragen,
 Hört' es lächelnd zu mir sagen:
 'Pfeifer, setz dich hin und schreib,
 Daß dein Lied im Sinne bleib.'
 So erklangs vor meinem Ohr,
 Und ich schnitt ein hohles Rohr,
 Schnitzte eine Feder dran,
 Macht' aus Wasser Dinte dann,
 Schrieb die Lieder hin zur Stund
 Daß sie sing' der Kinder Mund.

Von diesen frohen lieblichen Liedern können wir nur eine einzige Probe geben. Sie hat den Titel, Gründonnerstag, und beschreibt den an diesem Tage gewöhnlichen Zug der versammelten Kinder aus der Charity nach der St Pauls Kirche.

'Holy Thursday.'

'Twas on a Holy Thursday, their innocent faces clean,
 The children walking two and two in red and blue and green.
 Grey-headed beadles walked before with wands as white as snow,
 Till into the high dome of Paul's they like Thames's water flow.

Oh what a multitude they seemed, these flowers of London town,
 Seated in companies they sit with radiance all their own.
 The hum of multitudes was there, but multitudes of lambs,
 Thousands of little boys and girls raising their innocent hands.

Now like a mighty wind they raise to heaven the voice of song,
 Or like harmonious thunderings the seats of heaven among.
 Beneath them sit the aged men, wise guardians of the poor.
 Then cherish pity, lest you drive an angel from your door.

Es war am grünen Donnerstag, man sahe die Kinder ziehn,
 Sauber gewaschen, paarweis', gekleidet in roth und in blau und in grün;
 Grauköpfige Zuchtmeister mit schneeweißen Ruthen voran.
 In St. Pauls hohen Dom wie der Themse Fluthen strömen sie dann.

O! wie zahllos erscheinen sie da, diese Blumen von Londons Macht;
 Abgetheilt sitzend in Rotten, ganz in der eignen Unschuld Pracht.
 Es ersummt wie eine Menge, doch der Lämmer Menge nur allein.
 Tausend kleine Knaben und Mädchen erheben ihre Händchen so rein.

Jetzt wie ein Wirbelwind steigt zum Himmel Gesanges Chor,
 Wie ein harmonisch Gewitter zu den Sitzen der Engel empor.
 Zwischen den Kleinen die Alten, der Armuth weiser Hort—
 Drum erbarme dich vor deiner Thür, oder du treibst einen Engel fort.

Wir können nicht besser die mannichfaltigen Talente unsers Dichters ins Licht setzen, als indem wir auf dieses ausnehmend zarte und einfache Gedicht, die wahrhaft eigenthümliche und erhabene Beschreibung des Tigers folgen lassen.

'The Tyger.'

Tyger, Tyger, burning bright
 In the forests of the night;
 What immortal hand or eye
 Could frame thy fearful symmetry?

In what distant deeps or skies
 Burnt the fire of thine eyes?
 On what wings dares he aspire?
 What the hand dares seize the fire?

And what shoulder and what art
 Could twist the sinews of thy heart?
 And when thy heart began to beat,
 What dread hand? and what dread feet?

What the hammer, what the chain?
 In what furnace was thy brain?
 What the anvil? what dread grasp
 Dare it's deadly terror clasp?

When the stars threw down their spears,
 And water'd heaven with their tears:
 Did he smile his work to see?
 Did he who made the lamb, make thee?

Tyger, Tyger, burning bright
 In the forests of the night;
 What immortal hand or eye
 Could frame thy fearful symmetry?

'Der Tiger.'

Tiger, Tiger, Flammenpracht,
 In den Wäldern düstrer Nacht!
 Sprich, weiß Gottes Aug und Hand,
 Dich so furchtbar schön verband?
 Stammt vom Himmel, aus der Höll',
 Dir der Augen Feuerquell?
 Welche Flügel trägst du kühn?
 Wer wagt wohl zu nah'n dem Glüh'n?

Welche Stärke, welche Kunst,
 Wob so sinnreich Herzensbrunst?
 Als dein Herz den Puls empfand,
 Welch ein Fuß? und welche Hand?

Was ist Hammer? Kettenklirr'n?
 Welche Esse schmolz dein Hirn?
 Was ist Amboß? Welcher Held
 Muth in deinem Arm behält?

Aus den Sternen flog der Speer,
 Thränend ward der Himmel Meer:
 Schaut' er lächelnd da auf dich?
 Der das Lamm schuf, schuf er dich?

Tiger, Tiger, Flammenpracht
 In den Wäldern düstrer Nacht!
 Sprich, weiß Gottes Aug und Hand
 Dich so furchtbar schön verband?

Von den allegorischen Gesängen wollen wir lieber einen anführen, der wir zu verstehen glauben, als einen uns völlig unverständlichen. Folgender Gesang der Erfahrung soll wahrscheinlich den Menschen nach dem Verlust seiner Unschuld darstellen, wie er sehnsüchtig auf seinen früheren Zustand zurückblickt, gebunden durch das Gesetz und die Priester dessen Diener, wo früher kein Gebot, keine Pflicht, und nichts als reine Liebe und freywilliges Opfern statt fand.

'The Garden of Love.'

I went to the garden of love,
 And saw what I never had seen.
 A chapel was built in the midst
 Where I used to play on the green.

And the gates of the chapel were shut,
 And 'Thou shalt not' writ on the door.
 So I turned to the garden of love,
 That so many sweet flowers bore.

And I saw it was filled with graves,
 And tomb-stones where flowers should be,
 And Priests in black gowns were walking their rounds,
 And binding with briars my joys and desires.

'Der Garten der Liebe.'

Ich ging einst zum Garten der Liebe,
 Und sah was ich nimmer gesehn.
 Am Rasen stand eine Capelle,
 Wo sonst ich pflog spielend zu gehn.
 Und zu war die Thür der Capelle,
 Und 'Du sollst nicht' stand auf dem Thor.
 So kehrt' ich zum Garten der Liebe,
 Der Blumen sonst brachte hervor.

Und ich sah ihn mit Gräbern gefüllet,
 Und Grabstein' wo Liebe sollt' seyn;
 Und Priester in Trau'r umgingen die Mau'r,
 Und senkten in Schmerz mein liebendes Herz.

Außer diesen Gesängen sind uns noch zwey andere Werke der Poesie und Mahlerey von Blake zu Gesichte gekommen, von denen wir aber uns außer Stande bekennen müssen, eine genügende Beschreibung zu geben. Es sind zwey 1794 erschienene Quartbände, gedruckt und verziert wie die Gesänge, unter dem Titel: Europa, eine Weissagung (Europe, a prophecy), und: Amerika, eine Weissagung (America, a prophecy). Dunkler sind selbst die 'Weissagungen des Bakis' nicht. Amerika scheint zum Theil eine poetische Erzählung der Revolution zu bilden, denn es enthält die Namen mehrerer Parteyhäupter. Die Handelnden darin sind eine Art von Schutzengeln. Wir geben nur ein kurzes Probchen, von dem wir aber nicht zu entscheiden wagen, ob es Prosa oder in Versen seyn soll.

On these vast shady hills between America's and Albion's shore,
 Now barred out by the Atlantic Sea: called Atlantean hills,
 Because from their bright summits you may pass to the golden world,
 An ancient palace, archetype of mighty empires,
 Rears it's immortal summit, built in the forests of God,
 By Ariston the King of heaven for his stolen bride.

Auf jenem weiten Hayngebürge zwischen Amerika's Küsten und Albions,
 Nun ausgehöhlt von dem atlantischen Meer; einst der Atlantis Hügeln,
 Weil du von ihrem Strahlengipfel kömmtst zur Welt des Goldes,
 Erhebet uralt ein Pallast, Urbild mächtiger Weltreiche,
 Hoch sein unsterblich Haupt, erbaut in den Wäldern Gottes,
 Durch Ariston den König des Himmels, für seine gestohlene Braut.

Die Dunkelheit dieser Zeilen wird man in einem solchen Gedichte, von solch einem Manne, gern übersehen.

Europa ist eine ähnliche geheimnißvolle, unverständliche Rhapsodie, welche wahrscheinlich des Verfassers politische Ansichten der Zukunft enthält, aber ganz unerklärbar ist. Sie scheint in Versen seyn zu sollen, und dieß sind die vier ersten Zeilen.

I wrap my turban of thick clouds around my lab'ring head,
 And fold the sheety waters as a mantle round my limbs;
 Yet the red Sun and Moon
 And all the overflowing stars rain down prolific pains.

Ich winde die dunkeln Wolken zu einem Bund um mein arbeitend Haupt,
 Und schlage um meinen Leib den Mantel der wallenden Gewässer,
 Dennoch regnen die rothe Sonne und der Mond
 Und die überfließenden Sterne fortzeugende Qualen herab.

Diese Weissagungen scheinen wie die Gesänge nie zur Kunde des größeren Publikums gekommen zu seyn.

So hätten wir demnach Rechenschaft von allen uns auch nur flüchtig zu Gesicht gekommenen Werken dieses außerordentlichen Mannes gegeben. Weitläufig genug, um die Aufmerksamkeit Deutschlands auf einen Mann zu ziehen, in dem alle Bestandtheile der Größe, wenn gleich in unziemlichem Verhältnisse vermischt, unstreitig gefunden werden. Nähere Untersuchung, als uns vergönnt war, möchte vielleicht lehren, daß er als Künstler nie vollendete und unsterbliche, und als Dichter niemals fleckenlose Werke hervorbringen wird; aber dieß wird gewiß nicht den Antheil vermindern können, den alle Menschen, und die deutsche Nation gewiß in noch höherem Grade als selbst die englische, an der Betrachtung eines solchen Charakters nehmen müssen. Wir wollen nur an die Bemerkung eines geistreichen Schriftstellers erinnern, daß diejenigen Gesichter am anziehendsten sind, in welche die Natur etwas Großes legte, dabey aber die Ausführung vernachlässigte; denn ein Gleiches möchte wohl vom Gemüthe gelten¹.

¹ I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Privatdozent Dr H. Kauter of the University of Giessen who very kindly made Crabb Robinson's article accessible to me.

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

BANGOR.

L' 'ORLANDO FURIOSO' ET LA 'PRINCESSE DE BABYLONE' DE VOLTAIRE

Tout le monde est d'accord aujourd'hui pour reconnaître dans l'œuvre de Voltaire de nombreux points de ressemblance avec l'*Orlando Furioso*, voire même une imitation directe de l'Arioste. 'Voltaire, dit M. Jean Dubled (*Bulletin Italien*, 1913, p. 46), est après La Fontaine, celui de nos grands écrivains qui s'est approché le plus près de l'Arioste.' En particulier, les détails de l'inspiration ariostesque dans la *Pucelle* ont fait l'objet de nombreuses études. Par contre, on ne semble pas avoir étudié les relations qui existent entre l'*Orlando* et la *Princesse de Babylone*, ni avoir remarqué à quel point Voltaire, treize ans après la publication de la *Pucelle*, était encore sous l'influence de l'Arioste, lorsqu'en 1768 il composait la *Princesse de Babylone*.

A vrai dire, pendant au moins les cinquante dernières années de sa vie, Voltaire ne cessa d'être rempli d'admiration pour l'Arioste et d'exprimer cette admiration. Pour n'en donner que deux exemples, dans une lettre de 1759 il écrit: 'Tout roman devient insipide auprès de l'Arioste, tout est plat devant lui.' Et dans sa lettre du 15 Janvier 1761 à Mme du Deffand: 'L'Arioste est mon dieu. Tous les poèmes m'ennuient hors le sien. Je ne l'aimais pas assez dans ma jeunesse; je ne savais pas assez l'italien.'

Si l'on se demande ce qui dans l'Arioste charmait Voltaire, les qualités qui l'enthousiasmaient à ce point, on trouve à cette question réponse toute faite, soit une fois de plus dans sa Correspondance, soit dans le *Dictionnaire Philosophique*. En 1771, ce que Voltaire admire, c'est 'ce molle et facetum de l'Arioste, cette urbanité, cet atticisme, cette bonne plaisanterie' (*Dictionnaire Phil.*, Epopée. De l'Arioste). En 1774, dans une lettre à M. de Chamfort à la date du 16 Novembre, Voltaire s'étend plus encore sur les raisons de sa prédilection: 'Je vous avoue que cet Arioste est mon homme, ou plutôt un dieu, "il divin Ariosto" comme disent messieurs de Florence... La Fontaine est charmant dans ses bonnes fables... mais que l'Arioste est supérieur à lui, et à tout ce qui m'a jamais charmé, par la fécondité de son génie inventif, par la profusion de ses images, par la profonde connaissance du cœur humain, sans jamais faire le docteur, par ses railleries si naturelles dont il assaisonne les choses les plus terribles!' Il n'est pas surprenant de voir ces qualités appréciées par Voltaire: ce sont ces mêmes qualités que l'on admire aujourd'hui chez Voltaire lui-même; et il y aurait même lieu de se demander avec M. Natali (*Idee del Settecento*, p. 183) si les deux écrivains

n'ont point en commun quelque subtile affinité d'esprit, voire même, dans une certaine mesure, une conception de l'art littéraire et de la vie.

L'admiration de Voltaire ne se borne d'ailleurs pas là. Dans cette même lettre à M. de Chamfort il ajoute: 'J'y trouve toute la grande poésie d'Homère avec plus de variété, toute l'imagination des Mille et Une Nuits, la sensibilité de Tibulle, les plaisanteries de Plaute, toujours le merveilleux et le simple.' En réalité, ce n'est plus là de l'admiration. C'est de l'engouement, c'est de l'extase, et le mot est de Voltaire lui-même: 'La Fontaine est un charmant enfant que j'aime de tout mon cœur, mais laissez-moi en extase devant messer Lodovico...'

De quelle époque date cette admiration de Voltaire pour l'Arioste? Plus précisément encore, à quelle date Voltaire fit-il connaissance avec l'*Orlando*? Nous ne le savons pas de façon certaine. D'après M. Bouvy (*Voltaire et la Langue italienne, Revue des Langues Romanes*, Février 1896), ce serait en Angleterre, en composant son *Essai sur la Poésie épique*, qu'il aurait ouvert pour la première fois les poèmes d'Arioste, de Trissin, etc., et qu'il en aurait été violemment épris. Ce qui est sûr, c'est que son opinion sur la nature de l'*Orlando Furioso* subit d'importantes modifications. Au début, et pendant près de trente ans, il ne vit dans l'*Orlando* qu'une parodie des romans chevaleresques, et, comme tel, il refusa de le classer parmi les poèmes épiques. En 1728, dans le chapitre 7 de son *Essai sur la Poésie épique*, imprimé à la suite de la *Henriade*, il écrit: 'Quelques lecteurs s'étonneront que l'on ne place pas ici l'Arioste parmi les poètes épiques. Il est vrai que l'Arioste a plus de fertilité, plus de variété, plus d'imagination que tous les autres ensemble; et si on lit Homère par une espèce de devoir, on lit et on relit l'Arioste pour son plaisir. Mais il ne faut pas confondre les espèces.' De même en 1756: 'L'Arioste est un poète enchanteur, mais non épique!' Ce n'est que beaucoup plus tard, en 1771, dans son *Dictionnaire Philosophique* que Voltaire reviendra sur son jugement, et donnant à l'Arioste la place que nous lui donnons aujourd'hui, il écrira: 'Je n'avais pas osé autrefois le compter parmi les poètes épiques; je ne l'avais regardé que comme le premier des grotesques; mais en le relisant je l'ai trouvé aussi sublime que plaisant; et je lui fais très humblement réparation.' Et, développant son idée, motivant son jugement sur l'*Orlando*, il ajoutera: 'Ce qui m'a surtout charmé dans ce prodigieux ouvrage, c'est que l'auteur, toujours au-dessus de la matière, la traite en badinant. Il dit les choses les plus sublimes sans effort, et il les finit, souvent, par un trait de plaisanterie qui n'est ni déplacé ni recherché.'

C'est en 1768, pendant la période de transition entre sa première opinion de l'Arioste et la revision de cette opinion, que Voltaire publia

la *Princesse de Babylone*; et il y a tout lieu de croire qu'au moment où ce conte fut composé, l'*Orlando Furioso* faisait—et depuis longtemps—partie des lectures quotidiennes de Voltaire. Dès 1759, Voltaire écrivait à Mme du Deffand (17 Septembre): 'Je vous avouerai que je ne lis que l'Ancien Testament, trois ou quatre chants de Virgile, tout l'Arioste, une partie des Mille et Une Nuits et, en fait de prose française, je relis sans cesse les Lettres Provinciales.' En 1761, Voltaire a modifié et restreint ses lectures, mais l'Arioste est toujours sur la liste—très courte maintenant—des livres qui le fascinent. 'Arioste et le Pentateuque font aujourd'hui les charmes de ma vie' (à Mme du Deffand, 15 Janvier 1761). Les œuvres qu'il compose à cette époque sont une preuve plus grande encore du degré de l'influence qu'exerce sur lui l'Arioste. Son *Tancrède* est fondé presque entièrement sur l'épisode d'Ariodante et Ginevra (*Orlando Furioso*, IV, V, VI). Sa *Pucelle* est, comme le dit Voltaire lui-même dans sa lettre à Formont (1762), 'un poème dans le goût de Messer Ariosto,' son 'petit poème ariostin.' Toutes ces lettres et œuvres sont antérieures à la composition de la *Princesse de Babylone*. Si l'on passe maintenant à l'examen des lettres de Voltaire quasi contemporaines de la publication de la *Princesse*, on trouve toujours le même enthousiasme, la même admiration. L'année qui suit la publication de la *Princesse*, Voltaire écrit à Marenzi (13 Décembre 1769): 'Autrefois nos compatriotes faisaient un pèlerinage à Notre-dame de Lorette; j'en ferais un au tombeau de Messer Ariosto, si je n'étais pas trop près du mien.' En présence de tels témoignages, et nous rappelant à quel point Voltaire avait le don d'utiliser les matériaux qu'il rencontrait sur son chemin, nous ne nous étonnerons pas de trouver, dans la *Princesse de Babylone*, de nombreux emprunts à l'Arioste, tant en ce qui concerne les côtés essentiels du conte: histoire elle-même, structure, psychologie des personnages, esprit, qu'en ce qui concerne les détails: noms, objets, êtres fabuleux, géographie chimérique, etc..

Un grand point de ressemblance apparaît de suite quand on compare le sujet de l'*Orlando* et le sujet de la *Princesse de Babylone*: l'un comme l'autre tournent autour d'un point central qui est commun aux deux œuvres: la folie du personnage principal. Dans la *Princesse*, Amazan, 'le plus beau, le plus fort, le plus courageux, le plus vertueux des mortels,' perd la raison en apprenant que la femme qu'il aime, Formosante, a donné un baiser au roi d'Egypte. De même dans l'*Orlando*, tout le sujet a comme pivot la folie d'Orlando lui-même,

Che per amor venne in furore e matto,
D' uom che sì saggio era stimato prima.

(*Orl. Fur.*, I, 2.)

Ainsi donc, qu'il s'appelle Orlando ou Amazan, dans les deux cas le héros perd la raison, et dans les deux cas cette folie a une seule et même cause: l'amour.

De plus, non seulement les deux œuvres ont un pivot commun, mais toutes deux sont construites sur un même plan, avec une même symétrie: une première partie, un point central, une deuxième partie. Les événements de la première partie menent au point central; les événements de la deuxième partie découlent de ce point. De même qu'en apprenant de la bouche d'un berger l'amour d'Angelica pour Medoro, Orlando s'élance dans les bois et se met à parcourir l'Europe, de même Amazan, en apprenant par l'intermédiaire d'un merle les 'funestes amours' de Formosante avec le roi d'Egypte, quitte la maison paternelle et s'enfuit à travers le monde. Sans doute, Formosante n'est pas en réalité infidèle à Amazan, alors qu'Angelica, oubliant entièrement Orlando et la gratitude qu'elle lui doit, aime et épouse Medoro; mais ce n'est là qu'une différence de détail qui ne change rien, ni à la structure du sujet ni à la cause de la folie des deux héros.

De même, enfin, que la belle Angelica, courtisée par tous les Paladins et les rois de l'Orient, reste sourde à leurs avances et refuse leurs propositions pour épouser enfin un pauvre troupiier ('a farsi moglie d'un povero fante'), de même Amazan 's'enfuira de toutes les cours qu'il visitera sitôt qu'une dame lui aura donné un rendez-vous auquel il craindra de succomber,' il résistera en Chine 'aux plus aimables princesses du sang,' à 'la plus belle Scythe de toute la Scythie,' à 'la plus engageante Albionienne,' aux douze mille filles vénitiennes, 'pour succomber aux charmes d'une 'farceuse des Gaules.'

Ce n'est pas seulement similitude de situation entre les deux œuvres qu'il faut voir là, c'est aussi similitude d'esprit et d'ironie entre l'Arioste et Voltaire, qui tous deux s'efforcent de faire ressortir la faiblesse, l'inconséquence de la nature humaine. 'Voilà comme sont faits tous les jeunes gens d'un bout à l'autre du monde,' dira Voltaire, commentant l'inconstance de son héros, 'fussent-ils amoureux d'une beauté descendue du ciel, ils lui feraient, dans de certains moments, des infidélités pour une servante de cabaret.' L'Arioste avait dit avant lui:

E senza aver rispetto ch' ella fusse
Figlia del maggior re ch' abbia il Levante,
Da troppo amor costretta si condusse,
A farsi moglie d' un povero fante. (*Orl. Fur.*, XXIII, 120.)

Si l'on passe maintenant à l'étude de la psychologie d'Amazan, on ne peut là encore manquer de voir à quel point Voltaire s'est inspiré de l'Arioste pour créer son héros, Amazan, 'le plus beau, le plus fort, le plus courageux, le plus vertueux des mortels.' C'est un héros au même

titre qu'Orlando: comme lui, il est doué d'une force prodigieuse, d'une adresse surhumaine. Mais ce n'est là qu'une ressemblance superficielle entre les deux héros. Ce qu'il faut étudier, c'est la conduite d'Amazan pendant sa folie et la nature de cette folie. A vrai dire, cette folie est très limitée. Sa conduite semble admirable à l'Empereur de Chine qui dit en parlant de lui: 'Il m'a enchanté, cet aimable Amazan; il est vrai qu'il est profondément affligé; mais ses grâces n'en sont que plus touchantes; aucun de mes favoris n'a plus d'esprit que lui; nul mandarin de robe n'a de plus vastes connaissances; si j'étais assez malheureux, assez abandonné du Tien et du Changti pour vouloir être conquérant, je prierais Amazan de se mettre à la tête de mes armées, et je serais sûr de triompher de l'univers entier. C'est bien dommage que son chagrin lui dérange l'esprit.' Sa folie consiste uniquement à avoir 'juré de parcourir la terre et d'être fidèle'; elle le prive tout au plus 'd'assez de liberté dans l'esprit pour étudier les hautes sciences.' Voilà un héros bien étrange: c'est un être qui fait vœu d'une 'fidélité unique et inébranlable' au moment même où il est convaincu de l'inconstance de sa maîtresse, et qui tient à rester fidèle uniquement parce qu'il a perdu la raison. D'autre part, à peine a-t-il 'oublié son serment d'être toujours insensible à la beauté et inexorable aux tendres coquetteries,' à peine a-t-il succombé aux charmes de la farceuse des Gaules qu'il recouvre la raison. En faisant de son héros un fou, ou plutôt un homme plein de bon sens dans le fond et qui n'est fou que lorsqu'il est amoureux et jaloux par suite de la prétendue infidélité de sa maîtresse, Voltaire s'est contenté de reproduire les idées de l'Arioste, pour qui l'amour est une folie:

Che non è in somma amor se non insania,

A giudizio dei savi universale.

(*Orl. Fur.*, xxiv, 1.)

Voltaire semble avoir été tellement frappé par l'histoire de l'*Orlando* qu'on peut à juste titre se demander s'il n'est pas allé jusqu'à emprunter certains détails ou certaines situations, non plus à l'*Orlando Furioso* de l'Arioste, mais même à l'*Orlando Innamorato* de Boiardo. Il semble bien que ça ait été le cas; et si l'on compare la scène d'introduction de la *Princesse de Babylone* à la scène d'introduction de l'*Orlando Innamorato*, on trouve là encore une profonde ressemblance. Dans l'*Innamorato*, l'histoire commence par une description éblouissante d'une assemblée de la cour de Charlemagne. Tous ses amis sont là: rois, princes, chevaliers des autres royaumes de l'Europe, même ses ennemis les Sarrazins. Un grand tournoi doit avoir lieu. Un immense banquet le précède, pendant lequel tout à coup se présente la belle Angélique, accompagnée de quatre géants et de son frère qui, muni d'une lance magique, doit vaincre

les chevaliers. La *Princesse de Babylone* commence identiquement de la même manière: Charlemagne est devenu 'le vieux Bélus, roi de Babylone,' qui se croit 'le premier homme de la terre.' Un grand tournoi va avoir lieu. Un immense banquet doit suivre. Des trônes et sièges sont érigés pour tous les souverains curieux de voir le tournoi. 'Vingt mille pages et vingt mille jeunes filles distribuent des rafraîchissements,' quand tout à coup se présente Amazan, 'jeune inconnu monté sur une licorne, accompagné de son valet monté de même et portant sur le poing un oiseau fantastique.' Angelica était d'une beauté remarquable:

Essa sembrava mattutina stella,
E giglio d' oro e rosa dei verzieri;
In somma, a dir di lei la veritate,
Non fu veduta mai tanta beltate. (Orl. Innam., I, 1, 21.)

La beauté d'Amazan ne le cède en rien à celle d'Angelica: 'il avait l'air de la divinité. C'était le visage d'Adonis sur le corps d'Hercule; c'était la majesté avec les grâces.' Tous deux appartiennent à un type de beauté asiatique et inconnu à la cour où ils se présentent: Angelica vient du royaume de Cathay, c'est-à-dire de la Chine; Amazan vient du pays des Gangarides, 'peuple qui habite la rive occidentale du Gange.' Tous deux se présentent au moment où ils sont le moins attendus, tous deux accompagnés d'êtres fabuleux doués d'une puissance surhumaine. Angelica gagne tous les cœurs, Amazan 'charma toute l'assemblée'; et de même qu'Angelica quitte précipitamment l'assemblée et disparaît avec une rapidité fantastique, Amazan, de même, 'part comme un éclair, emporté par ses licornes' qui 'au galop dont elles allaient devaient faire cent lieues par jour.'

Il n'est pas jusqu'aux objets et aux noms des personnages qui ne semblent avoir été suggérés à Voltaire par l'Arioste. Quand Amazan, par exemple, apprend que les chercheurs ou anthropokaïes de la Bétique se sont saisis de Formosante et s'apprentent à la bruler vive, sous prétexte 'qu'elle a fait un pacte avec le diable, il s'arme d'une épée tranchante, appelée Fulminante, qui pouvait fendre d'un seul coup des arbres, des rochers et des druides.' Peu d'épées sont parvenues jusqu'à nous pourvues d'un nom, et parmi celles que nous connaissons, une des plus célèbres est assurément Durindana, l'épée d'Orlando. Le rapprochement est d'autant plus frappant que cette merveilleuse épée d'Amazan fait partie de 'l'ancienne armure de Magog' de même que Durindana avait, elle aussi, fait partie de l'ancienne armure d'Hector:

Durindana ch' Almonte ebbe in gran stima,
E Orlando or porta, Ettor portava prima. (Orl. Fur., XIV, 43.)

Quant aux noms des personnages, on ne peut lire et encore moins entendre prononcer l'admirable nom de Formosante sans se rappeler

les noms analogues si nombreux dans l'Arioste: Agramante, Sacripante, Bradamante, Aquilante, Fulvirante, Lamirante. (*Orl. Fur.*, I, II, XIV, XV.) Ce n'est pas aller trop loin que de voir dans Formosante un nom ariostesque.

Même les personnages fabuleux et la géographie chimérique utilisée par Voltaire dans la *Princesse de Babylone* semblent tirés de l'Arioste. Nous avons déjà vu qu'Angelica et Amazan, lorsqu'ils se présentent, la première à la cour de Charlemagne, le second à la cour de Bélus, sont accompagnés d'êtres fabuleux. De même les griffons de la *Princesse*, qui portent le canapé sur lequel voyage Formosante, et qui, nous dit Voltaire, 'cinglèrent vers le Gange avec la rapidité d'une flèche qui fend les airs,' semblent bien n'être qu'une adaptation du fameux hippogriffe dont parle l'Arioste,—sorte de Pégase, issu d'une jument et d'un griffon, dont la vitesse est telle qu'il reçoit le nom de 'celer ministro del fulmineo strale.' (*Orl. Fur.*, IV, 18-20; VI, 18.) Enfin, c'est probablement encore de l'Arioste que Voltaire tira sa connaissance de l'Arabie Heureuse et du merveilleux phénix. Arioste décrit les voyages d'Astolfo dans l'Orient et dit:

Vien per l' Arabia ch' è detta Felice,
 Ricca di mirra e d' odorato incenso,
 Che per suo albergo l' unica Fenice
 Eletto s' ha di tutto il mondo immenso,
 Finchè l' onda trovò vendicatrice
 Già d' Israel, che per divin consenso
 Faraone sommerse e tutti i suoi,
 E poi venne alla terra degli eroi. (*Orl. Fur.*, XV, 39.)

Cette association du phénix à l'Arabie Heureuse expliquerait un point laissé obscur par Voltaire: la nécessité pour l'oiseau d'avoir ses cendres transportées dans ce pays miraculeux avant qu'il puisse renaître à la vie.

Nous venons de voir dans quelle mesure Voltaire s'est inspiré de l'*Orlando* pour faire sa *Princesse de Babylone*, à quel point il s'est servi soit des idées de l'Arioste, soit de son plan, soit même des noms ou des détails du poème italien pour la composition de son sujet et de ses personnages, aussi bien que pour certains côtés ou éléments secondaires de son conte. Est-ce à dire que Voltaire se soit contenté de démarquer l'Arioste? Evidemment non. Comme tous les créateurs, comme Molière qui 'prend son bien où il le trouve,' Voltaire n'a fait des emprunts à l'Arioste que pour créer une œuvre originale et personnelle, œuvre de philosophie et de satire, œuvre d'artiste, de styliste, et aussi de penseur.

RENÉ P. LEGROS.

LONDON.

M. L. R. XXII

11

SOME NOTES ON THE TEXT OF DANTE'S 'DE VULGARI ELOQUENTIA'

IN a recent number of the *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana* (Vol. LXXXVI, pp. 289-338) Professor Aristide Marigo published an elaborate article of 50 pages on 'Il testo critico del *De Vulgari Eloquentia*,' which consists of a critical examination of the text of the Berlin MS., the new MS. brought to light by Dr Bertalot, and is incidentally largely concerned with the paper on 'The Bearing of the *Cursus* on the Text of Dante's *De Vulgari Eloquentia*,' communicated by me to the British Academy three or four years ago. Professor Marigo fully accepts my contention as to the influential part played by the *cursus* in the formation of the text. He approves the great majority of the readings adopted by me, but on a few of special interest and importance he differs from my conclusions, and has suggestions of his own to offer. He also discusses a certain number of passages, one or two of which had been overlooked by me, in which, in his opinion, the reading of the Berlin MS. has been either insufficiently considered, or wrongly rejected. With some of the emendations or restitutions proposed by him I have dealt in the following notes:

To take the passages in the order in which they occur in the treatise:

Bk I, ch. 4, l. 8.

For 'in principio legitur Genesis' here, the reading of the Grenoble and Trivulzian MSS., the Berlin MS. reads 'in principio loquitur Genesis.' Professor Marigo argues that the latter is to be preferred, on the ground that the use of *Genesis* as the genitive in the former is inadmissible, in confirmation of which he refers to *Monarchia*, III, 4, 11, where Dante uses the form *Geneseos*. But this argument is null, inasmuch as both *Genesis* and *Geneseos* were used for the genitive, as a reference to the *Catholicon* of Giovanni da Genova will show: he says, 'huius genesis vel geneseos.' The reading of the Berlin MS., however, seems preferable on other grounds. The somewhat unusual form of quotation, by the personification of the book quoted (with which compare 'Sapientia dicit' in *Epist.* x, § 22), may have led to the substitution of the *facilior lectio*, the more familiar formula, with *legitur*.

Bk I, ch. 4, l. 52.

The reading of the Grenoble and Trivulzian MSS., and of all the printed texts in this passage is as follows: 'Ad quod quidem dicimus quod bene potuit respondisse deo interrogante, nec propter hoc deus locutus est ipsam quam dicimus locutionem.'

The Berlin MS., however, for *ipsam quam* reads *ipsa quam*, the ablative instead of the accusative, which, as Professor Marigo points out, may well be the correct reading, as *loquor* with the ablative occurs several times elsewhere in this treatise, viz.:

I, 6, 49-50: 'Hac forma locutionis locutus est Adam, hac forma locutionis locuti sunt omnes posteri eius....'

I, 9, 69: 'Si vetustissimi Papienses nunc resurgerent, sermone vario vel diverso cum modernis Papiensibus loquerentur.'

I, 15, 5: 'Non male opinantur qui Bononienses asserunt pulcriori locutione loquentes.'

I, 18, 30: 'Hinc est quod in regis omnibus conversantes semper illustri vulgari loquuntur.'

Bk I, ch. 7, l. 26.

In the Berlin MS. the words 'sub persuasione gigantis' are followed by the letter *n* between two points (*.n.*), an addition which is not found in the Grenoble and Trivulzian MSS., and which, though registered by Bertalot in the *apparatus criticus* of his edition, is ignored by him in his text.

This *.n.*, which is obviously meant as an abbreviation of *Nembrot*, Nimrod, the traditional builder of the Tower of Babel, has every appearance of being a marginal gloss, to explain *gigas*, which has found its way into the text in the Berlin MS. That the word *Nembrot* formed part of the original text is rendered improbable by the fact that its insertion would involve the violation of the *cursus*, which is otherwise strictly observed throughout the whole period (lines 24-33), in a series of nine consecutive clausulae; namely: sub persuasióne gigántis (pl.); superáre natúram (pl.); naturántem qui Déus est (t.); túrrim in Sénnaar (t.); dícta est Bábel (pl.); hóc est confúsio (t.); sperábat ascéndere (t.); íncius non aequáre (v.); superáre factórem (pl.).

Bk I, ch. 8, ll. 57-64.

In this puzzling passage Dante is defining the boundaries of the *langue d'oïl*. According to the reading of the Grenoble and Trivulzian MSS., which is followed by Rajna in his first two editions, he is made to say: 'Loquentes oïl quodam modo septentrionales sunt respectu istorum

[i.e. qui sî dicunt]; nam ab oriente Alamannos habent et a septentrione; ab occidente anglico mari vallati sunt, et montibus Aragoniae terminati; a meridie quoque Provinciliabus et Apennini devexione clauduntur.' 'Those who say *oïl* are in some sort northerly in respect of those who say *sî*; for on the East and the North they have the Germans; on the West they are enclosed by the English sea, and bounded by the mountains of Aragon; and on the South they are shut in by the inhabitants of Provence and by the slopes of the Apennines.'

But it is hardly possible that Dante can have written this, crediting him as it does with the supposition that a part of Germany lies to the North of France, and that the English Channel is to the West of it.

In the Berlin MS. the error with regard to the North boundary, so far as Germany is concerned, is eliminated; but the West boundary remains a puzzle. The reading in this MS. is: 'nam ab oriente Alamannos habent et ab occidente et septentrione angallico mari vallati sunt et montibus Aragoniae terminati,' that is, France of the *langue d'oïl* is bounded on the East by Germany, and (assuming, as recent editors have done, that *angallico* is merely a blunder for *anglico*) on the West and North by the English Channel, with the Pyrenees as the terminus. Here we have the English Channel correctly given as the North boundary; but how is the difficulty of its extension to the position occupied by the Bay of Biscay to be got over? The solution, as Professor Marigo suggests, no doubt lies in the word *angallico*; the scribe, anticipating Lewis Carroll's invention of the 'portmanteau-word,' in a moment of aberration wrote *angallico* instead of *anglico et gallico*. 'Gallicum mare' or 'Gallicus oceanus' was the recognised name for the Bay of Biscay; as was 'Anglicum' or 'Britannicum mare' ('la mer d'Angleterre,' as Brunetto Latino calls it) for the English Channel. But if we accept the enumeration of the points of the compass in the order adopted in this MS., namely E. W. N. S., instead of E. N. W. S., as in the Grenoble and Trivulzian MSS., the geographical confusion becomes worse confounded, for in that case we are confronted with the English Channel on the West of France, and the Bay of Biscay on the North. To effect the required transposition, the scribe should either have given the points of the compass counter-clockwise, as in the other two MSS., or should have shuffled the constituents of his 'portmanteau-word,' and written *gallanglico* instead of *angallico*. On a review of the existing evidence it seems reasonable to conclude that what Dante wrote was: 'ab oriente Alamannos habent; a septentrione et ab occidente anglico et gallico mari vallati sunt, et montibus Aragoniae terminati'—'they have the Germans on the East,

and are enclosed by the English and French seas on the North and West, and bounded by the mountains of Aragon¹.'

Bk I, ch. 14, l. 25.

Professor Marigo has his own solution of the problem in this passage, namely, how to fill the hiatus after *dubitare* in the Grenoble and Trivulzian MSS. so as satisfactorily to account for the meaningless *doctor*, which follows after *dubitare* in the Berlin MS., and at the same time to satisfy the requirements of the *cursus*. After mentioning the various solutions which have been proposed Professor Marigo says: 'Ma *docet* del Bertalot, *cogit* del Rajna, *auctorat* del Toynbee, sono tentativi divinatori che potrebbero anche moltiplicarsi: nessuno contenta nè spiega esaurientemente l' errore, e però sono da rigettarsi; anche quello del Toynbee, il quale adduce a sostegno il *cursus*, che può certo dar peso ad una lezione, ma che non basta da solo a giustificarla.' Then without further preamble follows the *ex cathedra* pronouncement: 'La lezione vera è questa: *dubitares, lector*.'

Why this particular conjecture—for it is necessarily as much a conjecture as any of the others—should be acclaimed as 'la vera lezione,' and not be consigned with the rest to the limbo of *tentativi divinatori*, Professor Marigo does not vouchsafe to explain.

It is certainly not free from serious objections. To begin with, it involves a violation of the *cursus*, which, as I pointed out when discussing this passage on a previous occasion, is strictly observed through a series of sixteen clausulae in the first twenty-five lines of this chapter, and which if anywhere should be observed in the final clausula of the period.

Professor Marigo, as I have already remarked, is fully alive to the important part played by the *cursus* in the constitution of the text. He not only endorses the conclusions in my paper on the subject, which it is evident he has very carefully studied², but he asserts them emphatically

¹ The confused state of the text as it has come down to us is no doubt a case of 'pie,' as to which see Moore, *Studies in Dante*, iv, pp. 6, 23. Moore shows how easily a confused sentence like that in the text may arise—words accidentally omitted by a primitive copyist, and by him (or another) written in the margin, subsequently get inserted in the text, but in the wrong place. The process is analogous to that by which marginal glosses become embodied in the text.

² Ho avuto occasione di accennare più volte all' uso del *cursus* nel trattato dantesco. Può parere strano che questo artificio, regolarmente usato secondo le norme delle *artes dictaminis* nelle *Epistole*, trovi posto in un' opera dottrinale come la nostra. Ma il fatto fu ormai dimostrato dell' accurato recente studio del Paget Toynbee, e non può essere messo in dubbio che Dante ha applicato qui il ritmo prosaico latino in larghissima misura (il Toynbee ha riscontrato ben 1150 esempi di *cursus*); e non solamente nelle parti in cui lo stile si eleva ad una certa solennità eloquente, ma perfino in molte puramente argomentative od espositive. Gli è che in Dante era innato il senso dell' armonia e l' atteggiamento della sua prosa... diventa spesso spontaneamente ritmico' (p. 35=[323]).

on his own account in one of the introductory sections of his article in which he treats of the language and style of the treatise.

'Lo stile,' he writes, 'è una fusione di quello della Scolastica con quello dei dettatori, con assoluta prevalenza, in certe parti, di quest' ultimo; le clausole ritmiche hanno massima importanza in tutto il trattato, entrando spesso anche nelle parti puramente espositive e dialettiche' (p. 12 = [300]). Yet in presenting his emendation of this passage for acceptance—a crucial passage for the application of the principles of the *ars dictaminis*—he simply ignores any consideration of the *cursus* altogether, obviously owing to the fact that its requirements are not met by his proposed emendation.

In the next place, *dubitares* is an unwarrantable departure from the reading of the MSS., all three of which concur in reading *dubitare*. If however *dubitare* needed correction, a more plausible emendation than 'dubitares, lector' might have suggested itself, namely 'dubitaret auditor,' which at any rate would avoid the violation of the *cursus*.

Further, the appeal to the reader introduced here by Professor Marigo, which involves an awkward change of construction ('non solum disterminat... sed dubitares'), does not ring true. Dante appeals to the reader on five occasions in the present treatise, and it will be observed that in each case the apostrophe to the 'lector' is interjected at the beginning of the sentence, and is never postponed to the end of the period, as Professor Marigo's emendation would have it. The five instances are as follows:

I, 7, 20: 'Ecce, lector, quod vel oblitus homo vel vilipendens disciplinas priores... tertio insurrexerit ad verbera....'

II, 6, 74: 'Nec mireris, lector, de tot reductis auctoribus ad memoriam.'

II, 7, 23: 'Intuearis ergo, lector, attente, quantum, etc.'

II, 10, 41: 'Vide igitur, lector, quanta licentia data sit cantiones poetantibus.'

II, 12, 69: 'Satis hinc, lector, sufficienter elicere potes qualiter, etc....'

In view of these objections I submit that Professor Marigo's confident claim on behalf of *dubitares, lector*, as 'la lezione vera' cannot be conceded, and that consequently the reading *dubitare auctorat* of the fourth edition of the *Oxford Dante* still holds the field.

Bk I, ch. 16, ll. 1-7.

In this passage Dante likens the quest for the ideal language of Italy to the pursuit of a panther, and says that as the attempts hitherto made to capture it have failed, another method must be adopted. The passage

in question in Rajna's critical text, which has here been followed in the *Oxford Dante*, runs: 'Postquam venati saltus et pascua sumus Italiae, nec panteram quam sequimur adinvenimus, ut ipsam reperire possimus, rationabilius investigemus de illa, ut solerti studio redolentem ubique, et necubi apparentem, nostris penitus irretiamus tenticulis.'

That is, 'After having hunted through the woods and pastures of Italy without lighting on the panther we are in pursuit of, in order that we may be able to find her, let us search her out by a more rational method, so that by skill and application we may succeed in enclosing in our toils the quarry whose scent is everywhere, but which nowhere shows itself.'

Rajna's text, however, in one important respect departs from that of the MSS., all three of which in the last sentence have the corrupt reading 'redolentem ubique et ubi apparentem.' Various emendations have been proposed of this meaningless reading. Trissino in his translation (first published in 1529), the earliest form in which the treatise appeared in print, renders 'quella, che in ogni luogo si sente, et in ogni parte appare,' showing that he read 'redolentem ubique et ubique apparentem,' a reading which was adopted by Torri and by Fraticelli (in his later editions), and which is now, strangely enough, defended by Professor Marigo. Corbinelli, in the *editio princeps* of the Latin text (1577), followed by Fraticelli in his earlier editions, read 'redolentem ubique, et nec apparentem,' while Giuliani, adopting a suggestion of Witte, and at the same time *more suo* otherwise arbitrarily altering the text, reads 'redolentem ubique, nec usquam residentem.'

Both *et nec* and *nec usquam* are acceptable so far as the sense is concerned, but while the former might have given rise to the *et ubi* of the MSS. by a confusion between the abbreviated form of *ubi* (namely *u* with *i* superscript, *û*) and that of *nec* (*n* with *c* superscript, *ñ*), *nec usquam* must be ruled out on palaeographical grounds. Rajna's *et necubi*, however, is preferable to *et nec* in that it satisfies the requirements not only of the sense and of palaeography (the omission of abbreviated *nec* being easily accounted for by the carelessness of a copyist), but also those of the *cursus*, which, with the introduction of this emendation, is observed in a regular series of clausulae: 'ut ipsam reperire possimus (pl.), rationabilius investigemus in illa (pl.), ut solerti studio redolentem ubique (v. + pl.), et necubi apparentem (v.), nostris penitus irretiamus tenticulis (t.).'

Professor Marigo's attempt to rehabilitate the discredited reading 'redolentem ubique et ubique apparentem' (or 'redolentem ubique, ubique apparentem,' as he misreads it) is hardly calculated to strengthen

his position as a textual critic. He argues that 'ubique apparentem' is preferable to 'necubi apparentem,' firstly, because *necubi* in classical and (as he assumes) in medieval Latin is used as the equivalent not of 'nec usquam' but of 'ne usquam'; secondly, because even if it could bear the sense of 'nec usquam' it would not give the meaning required by the passage. He writes: 'Che sia *ubique* da preferirsi al *necubi* del Rajna, mantenuto dal Bertalot e dal Toynbee, parrà evidente a chi osservi che non solo *necubi* non è dato nè dai lessici classici, nè da quelli medievali, se non in senso finale e consecutivo, ma che anche male risponde al senso qui richiesto un *necubi* per *nec usquam*, poichè non si può irretire una fiera che non si lascia vedere in nessun luogo.'

To take the second point first—the context clearly shows that Dante is speaking of an elusive quarry whose scent he is following, but which so far he has not succeeded in viewing—before it can be taken in the toils the quarry must be found. The elusive nature of the quarry is emphasised again later on in this same chapter, where carrying on the metaphor of the chase Dante says of the vernacular he has been in pursuit of, that its scent is in every city, but its lair in none—'nunc potest discerni vulgare quod superius venabamur, quod in qualibet redolet civitate, nec cubat in ulla.'

As regards the objection to *necubi* in the sense of *nusquam*, Professor Marigo has apparently overlooked the fact that, as Rajna points out, it is used in this sense both by Varro and by Columella. Rajna does not quote instances, but I have little doubt that he had in mind those given in Scheller and Riddle's *Lexicon*; namely in Varro: 'Faciunt lapide strata, ut urina necubi in stabulo consistat' (*De Re Rust.* ii, 2, § 19); that is, 'They make the pavement of stone in order that the stale may nowhere stand in the stable.' And in Columella: 'Grumos, quos ad versuram plerumque tractae crates faciunt dissipabimus ita, ut necubi ferramentum foenisecis possint offendere' (*De Re Rust.* ii, 17, § 4); that is, 'The heaps which the harrows are apt to make where they turn must be scattered, so that they may not anywhere be an obstruction to the implements of the grass-cutters.'

Bk II, ch. 4, ll. 19–20.

In the much discussed passage containing Dante's definition of poetry the Berlin MS. reads: 'si poesim recte consideremus . . . nihil aliud est quam fictio rhetorica musicaque poita.' The point in dispute at the present time is the last word, *poita*. In the Trivulzian MS. it is written *poīta*, with a contraction mark over the *i*, which is one of the recognised abbreviations

of *posita*; in the Grenoble MS. it is written *posita* in full. The natural assumption, therefore, is that the scribe of the Berlin MS., by an error very common to his fraternity, omitted the contraction mark over the *i*, and that the *poita* in that MS. is meant to represent *posita* as in the other two MSS.

Poita, however, without contraction mark, may have a meaning of its own. In medieval Latin there was a verb *poio*, formed from the Greek *ποιέω*, which in the *Magnae Derivationes* of Ugucione da Pisa, the Latin dictionary of which, as I have shown elsewhere, Dante made extensive use, is explained as follows: '*Poio*, -is, -ivi, -tum, idest *finigo*, -is, -gere, unde hic *poeta*, -e, et proprie carminum alta verba loquens¹.' Consequently it is argued by Professor Marigo and others that the *poita* of the Berlin MS. is not an error of the copyist for *poita*, the abbreviation of *posita*, but is the participle of *poire*, a verb which was certainly known to Dante, for he uses it in the last line of his second Latin Eclogue:

Callidus interea iuxta latitavit Iolas,
Omnia qui didicit, qui retulit omnia nobis:
Ille quidem nobis; et nos tibi, Mopse, poimus.

It is further urged in support of *poita* as participle of *poire* that with this reading the regular observance of the *cursus* is assured, *musicâque poita*, giving a normal *plenus*, whereas the reading *musicâque posita*, which is that favoured by Rajna, involves the violation of the *cursus*.

But, as Rajna justly observes, an exotic and little known word like *poire* would be decidedly out of place in a definition, in which, if it is to serve its purpose, it is essential that the terms used should be familiar and intelligible to the generality. This is in accordance with what Dante himself says elsewhere in this treatise: '*ex diffinientium cognitione diffiniti resultat cognitio*' (II, 9, ll. 4-5). If, therefore, Dante wrote *poita*, the participle of *poire*, he was disregarding his own *dictum*, and might be charged with attempting to explain *ignotum per ignotius*.

My own solution of the problem is that printed in the last edition of the *Oxford Dante*, viz. *musicâque compósita*. This reading, which is based on the assumption that, as the abbreviations of *que* and *com-* in MSS. are somewhat alike, one of them has dropped out, gives the required meaning, and at the same time restores the *cursus*, producing a normal *tardus*. Professor Marigo, however, dismisses this emendation as unsatisfactory on the trivial ground that Dante does not happen to have used

¹ Giovanni da Genova, in his *Catholicon*, which is very largely indebted to Ugucione's *Derivationes*, says: '*Poio*, -is, -ivi, -ire, -itum, idest *finigo*, -gis vel *facio*... a *poio*, -is, dicitur hic *poeta*, -te, idest *fictor*, et proprie carminis alta verba loquens... a *poio*, -is, dicitur hec *poesis*, ipsa ars poetandi vel *figmentum*.'

the verb *componere* elsewhere; and he concludes his note on this passage with the dogmatic assertion: 'l' unica lezione accettabile è dunque, oltre che per il senso, anche per il *cursus*, musicàque poita.' Whether this view will prevail remains to be seen.

Bk II, ch. 4, ll. 63-8.

Rajna's text of this passage is as follows: 'Caveat ergo quilibet et discernat ea quae dicimus: et quando tria haec pure cantare intendit, vel quae ad ea directe ac pure secuntur, prius Elicone potatus, tensis fidibus, adsumptum secure plectrum tum movere incipiat.' 'Let every one therefore take heed and mark what we say; and when he purposes to sing of these three subjects [namely *salus, amor, et virtus*] simply, or of those things which directly and simply pertain to them, let him first drink a draught of Helicon, and then, having stretched the strings, let him confidently take the plectrum and begin to ply it.'

Adsumptum in the last sentence is Rajna's emendation of the MS. reading, in which all three agree, viz. *ad supremum*; there can be little doubt, however, as Professor Marigo points out, that this emendation is not called for, and that the true reading is not 'tensis fidibus, adsumptum secure plectrum tum movere incipiat,' but 'tensis fidibus ad supremum, secure plectrum tum movere incipiat,' that is, 'having stretched the strings to the highest pitch, let him then confidently begin to ply the plectrum.' The *cursus* is decisively in favour of the MS. reading, 'fidibus ad supréum' giving a *velox*, and thus completing the series of clausulae in the whole passage, which is interrupted by the introduction of Rajna's emendation.

I regret to say that I overlooked this point when revising the text of the treatise for the fourth edition of the *Oxford Dante*, in which Rajna's reading is maintained; in consequence this instance is omitted from the list in my paper on 'The bearing of the *cursus* on the text of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*.' An amusing blunder was made by Trissino in his translation of this passage, which was perpetuated by Corbinelli in the *editio princeps*, and has been reproduced in the successive editions of Fraticelli, Torri, and Giuliani, down to 1896, when it was exposed and corrected by Rajna in his first critical edition of the treatise. For 'tum' and 'movere' the scribe of the Trivulzian MS., that used by Trissino, wrote *cum* and *more* (for *movere*) without the mark of abbreviation. Trissino consequently took these words to be a phrase, and translated 'cum more incipiat,' by 'costumatamente cominci,' 'let him begin in his accustomed manner'!

Bk II, ch. 6, l. 85.

The reading of all editors in this passage is 'multos alios, quos amica solitudo nos visitare invitat,' i.e. 'many other authors, whose works friendly solitude invites us to consult,' a passage which has always been included among Dante's pathetic allusions to his exile from Florence. The reading *solitudo*, however, as Professor Marigo points out, has no MS. support; the reading of all three MSS. being *sollicitudo*. In the Berlin MS., in which the word is spelt with double *ll*, it remains unaltered; but in both the Grenoble and Trivulzian MSS. it has been changed to *solitudo* by the crossing out, by a later hand in each case, of the syllable *ci*. This alteration was due in the first place to Trissino, who translates: 'molti altri, i quali la nostra amica solitudine ci invita a vedere'; from him, no doubt, it was adopted by Corbinelli in the *editio princeps* of the Latin text, and consequently *solitudo* has been the accepted reading ever since. But in the face of the agreement of all three MSS. it is questionable how far the alteration is justified. From a literary and sentimental point of view, to revert to *sollicitudo* would be a decided loss; but it is precisely such a consideration which will have prompted the substitution of *solitudo*. Further, transcriptional probability seems in favour of the MS. reading—is a copyist with *solitudo* before him likely to have substituted the longer word? On the whole, therefore, sentiment apart, it would appear that *sollicitudo* should be restored to the text.

Bk II, ch. 7, l. 1.

For 'Grandiosa modo vocabula,' the reading of the Grenoble and Trivulzian MSS. and of all the printed texts, the Berlin MS. reads 'Grandiosa quaeque modo vocabula.' 'Quaeque' is hardly likely to have been inserted by a copyist unless it was in his exemplar; whereas in its abbreviated form *q* with *e* superscript followed by the *z*-like symbol representing *que* (thus *q̄s*), it might easily have been overlooked and dropped out. It has as a matter of fact been overlooked and omitted both from text and *apparatus criticus* by Dr Bertalot in his edition based on the Berlin MS., and it has also escaped the critical eye of Professor Marigo.

Bk II, ch. 9, ll. 37-9.

In this passage, in which Dante gives his definition of the stanza, the reading of the printed texts is as follows: 'Sic colligere possumus ex praedictis diffinientes et dicere: stantiam esse sub certo cantu et habitudine limitatam carminum et syllabarum compagem,' i.e. 'we may thus collect the defining terms from what has been said, and state that a

stanza is a structure of lines and syllables, limited in respect of a certain musical setting and the arrangement of its parts.'

But *limitatam* is not the reading of the MSS., all three of which read *limitata*, this word in the Grenoble MS. being followed by a comma, whereby it is plainly indicated that *limitata* is not a scribal error for *limitatam* (by the omission of the contraction mark over the final *a*) agreeing with *compagem*, but belongs to the previous clause in agreement with *habitudine*. This, as Professor Marigo notes, is confirmed by the *cursus*, the pause after *limitata* giving the *velox* 'habitudine limitata,' whereas if the pause be after *habitudine* there is a violation of the *cursus*.

With the reading *limitata* the definition of the stanza would be 'a structure of lines and syllables subject to a certain musical setting and a restricted arrangement of its parts,'—an arrangement ('partium habitudo') which Dante discusses in two subsequent chapters (11 and 12) of this book.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM,
BUCKS.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON LUIS DE LEÓN'S LYRICS¹

III. THE CHRONOLOGY OF LUIS DE LEÓN'S LYRICS.

SINCE the date of Menéndez y Pelayo's essay on León in *Horacio en España* there has been substantive agreement among scholars as to the general outline of his poetic development. Certain poems contain references to the hopes and fears that arose from his imprisonment in the cells of the Inquisition, and therefore must be referred to the period 1572-6. It is not, however, quite certain that all poems written during that period contained references to his sufferings. Certain other poems speak of these anxieties as now past, and are therefore posterior to 1576. These lyrics are of a personal and contemplative cast, and all poems of a subjective type are to be dated later than 1576; all of an objective type, and which do not refer to present or past anxieties, may be placed before 1572. We have seen, however, that agreement is not always possible as to whether a poem, such as *Cuán descansada vida*, represents the poet's aspirations or the experience of another, and that allusions, such as 'roto casi el navío,' may be misunderstood or disputed: the divisions made by Menéndez y Pelayo's criteria are no more than general, and give us no great insight into the poet's mental growth. The researches of M. Coster and Mr Bell give much greater precision to this chronology, by seeking out allusions to historical events (which are very rare) and by following bibliographical clues. León would be prompt, in M. Coster's opinion, to incorporate in his work the most striking novelties of classical research which reached his hand, so that the date of issue of a convenient or noteworthy edition of a classic, such as Barrientos' Macrobius in 1570 or Lambinus' Lucretius in 1564, other circumstances being unknown, provides a probable date for lyrics which use these sources. One other line of enquiry, which has not perhaps been sufficiently explored, is to compare the ideas and phrases of different poems. Coincidences of thought and word may be due to identity of emotion and therefore proximity in time. This is, at least, a service to criticism, and it does provide a defensible chronology that has reference to the evolution of León's thought.

¹ Continued from *Modern Language Review*, xxii, p. 60.

A. *Poems of the First Period (until 1572).*

A Santiago, Profecía del Tajo. These poems have been variously dated. Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly thought *A Santiago* might belong to the year 1571; M. Coster assigns it to 1571 and the *Profecía* to 1551; Mr Bell prefers 1557-8 for both. He calls attention, as others have done before him, to the partial identity of their subject-matter, and to the formal superiority of the *Profecía*, which is on that account presumed to be the more recent poem. The essential feature of these poems for criticism, and I think for chronology, is their similarity of content. Their central incidents are the sin of Rodrigo and la Cava, the gathering of the infidels and their passage to Spain, the battle of Guadalete, the march through Andalusia and Aragon and 'toda la triste y espaciosa España,' and the first Christian triumph at the battle of Clavijo with the aid of St James in person. These events occupy the years 711-844. Previous to this main action we hear of the Christianising of Spain by the Apostle, and there is a recital of the future greatness of Spain and of the order of St James. In the *Profecía del Tajo* the geography is carefully studied (the Moors assemble at Ceuta, disembark at Cadiz, and fight on the Guadalquivir), though incorrect, and the precise details concerning the troops engaged (the skirmishing Arabs contrasting with the heavy-armed Gothic horse and foot) indicate a settled plan and considerable reading. The manner of both poems is epic, and they present a subject, with its episodes before and after the main action, which might easily have become an epic poem on classical lines. It is less easy to discover whence came the suggestion for these poems. Both M. Coster and Mr Bell connect the *Profecía del Tajo* with one of León's visits to the city of Toledo, which was full of relics of the last of the Goths. The poet obtained the degree of 'bachiller' from the University of Toledo, and incorporated it at Salamanca in October of 1558. M. Coster arbitrarily assigns this baccalaureate to the year 1551-2 in order to bring this poem as near as possible to a Toledan edition of the *Crónica Sarracina*, issued in 1549. Mr Bell considers that the degree may have been obtained after León's session at Alcalá de Henares in 1556-7, and he connects the ode *A Santiago* with the Greater Festival of St James, which fell on Sunday, 25 July 1557. This ode, in M. Coster's opinion, must be delayed until 1571 when León's friend Portocarrero, now Governor of Galicia, had reason to visit the tomb of St James. But it is not desirable to sever the connection of *A Santiago* and *Profecía del Tajo* by an interval of twenty years, nor is it easily credible that a second poem on a given

subject should be formally inferior to the first. Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly conjectured that the 'morisca armada' might contain an allusion to the Turkish navy at the battle of Lepanto, but the words are unavoidable in a poem dealing with a Moorish naval expedition. The only certainty in connection with these poems is the mutual intimacy of their matter and manner, so that M. Coster's conclusions are not acceptable. Two dates can be defended: Mr Bell's 1557-8, which makes the poems spring from the Greater Festival of 1557 and the degree earned probably in 1558, the epic tone being an acknowledgment of a new peninsular fashion in literature; and 1571, which refers the historical inspiration to the truly epic struggle with the Turk, not dissimilar from the strife on the Guadalete, the literary suggestion being, perhaps, the success of Ercilla's *Araucana*. There is heroic matter in the adaptation of Horace, *Odes*, II, xii, and in *Virtud hija del cielo*, both of which are under the influence of the victory won at Lepanto in October of 1571. The principal objection to Mr Bell's date is that it separates the *Profecia del Tajo* by more than ten years from any poem by León of equal maturity.

De la Magdalena ('Elisa, ya elpreciado'), *Contra un juez avaro*. These two poems are dateless, but they are marked by a common violence and crudity of manner which does not convince us that they were directed towards any particular persons. This crudity is, I think, a mark of the immaturity of the poet. As 'Elisa' is a normal anagram for Isabel, M. Coster enumerates the Isabels known to Luis de León, but he thinks that a direct comparison to the Magdalene would be too emphatic for any of them. Perhaps a near relation or a spiritual daughter, entering a convent in a moment of contrition, might have found a melancholy pleasure in these attributes of the 'chief of sinners' in proportion to their actual untruth, and if this relative were Isabel Osorio, to whom León sent a translation of the *Song of Songs* in 1561, this lyric might be referred to *circa* 1560. The mention of a certain 'Lida' is unprofitable, as the passage is probably based on Horace, *Odes*, II, xi: 'quis devium scortum eliciet domo / Lyden?' The *Epitafio al túmulo del príncipe don Carlos* and *Canción a la muerte del mismo* are almost certainly apocryphal. The latter is disfigured by clichés such as 'la fénix que sola tuvo el mundo,' from which León is always commendably averse.

Horace was one of the authors read in the Arts curriculum at Salamanca, and his influence (*Odes*, I, xv: Nereus' prophecy) is discoverable in the *Profecia del Tajo*, which may belong to 1558. Menéndez y Pelayo, and all critics after him, have pointed to what seems a schoolboy's 'howler' in the translation of 'salis avarus' by 'de sal avariento' in

Odes, II, xviii¹; but it is also certain that not all of León's translations from Horace are early, and indeed those to which we can put a date were made after his fortieth year. Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas cannot but have had an important influence on León's Horatian studies. His lectures on the third book of the *Odes*, delivered during 1556, may not have attracted notice, but if he had, as is conjectured², a hand in the Salamancan edition of Horace in 1560, he must have conferred a benefit on Horace's best translator, and this would be deepened after the commencement of their friendship in 1568. He is probably the Francisco Sánchez who, with Alonso de Espinosa and D. Juan de Almeida (Rector in 1568), submitted to our poet's judgment translations of *Odes*, I, xiv, to which León's rendering is an answer; and he held in his possession versions of *Odes*, I, xxii; II, x; IV, xiii and *Epode* ii, which he published in his annotated Garci-Lasso in 1574. The free imitation of Horace's renunciation of epic poetry (*Odes*, II, xii) is later than the news of the battle of Lepanto, fought on 7 October 1571 ('el mar con turca sangre hora bañada'). This is one of the poems which refer to an elusive, and probably fictitious, 'Nise,' who is also mentioned in the translations or imitations of *Odes*, I, v; II, viii and ix (with the additional verses), two sonnets, and the *Imitación de Petrarca*, which is as late as 1577. The simile of the mountain oak (*Odes*, IV, iv) attracted his attention only after his imprisonment. It was first publicly used, in Latin, on the title-page of his commentary on the *Song of Songs*, written between 1577 and 1580. What is doubtless a first draft in Spanish may be read in the *Exposición de Job*, VIII, 20, a more polished variant occurring in the final redaction of the ode *Qué vale cuanto vee*. This translation, therefore, pertains to the year 1577 or 1578. Before he could assimilate the manner of Horace to his own quite different temperament,

¹ Professor I. G. Llubera has called my attention to the commencement of this ode:

Aunque de marfil y oro
no está en mi casa el techo jaspeado
con la labor del moro.

These lines coincide with the phrases used in the *Descansada vida*:

Ni del dorado techo
se admira, fabricado
del sabio moro, en jaspes sustentado.

The ode may, therefore, belong to the year 1577. In both cases there appears to be an allusion to the Alhambra, but though Mr Bell believes León to have visited Granada in 1562 no satisfactory evidence has been adduced. León certainly visited Córdoba in 1570, and he may have been impressed by the celebrated Mezquita with its double horse-shoe arches that support the roof. To the translation of *Odes*, II, xviii, therefore, one would assign a period 1570-7 with a preference for 1577. 'Howlers' are not confined to schoolboys, but afflict the best of us in moments of relaxed vigilance.

² Gallardo, *Ensayo*, IV, 3851.

León must have devoted years to the study of his model, and it is possible that the majority of direct translations were made between 1560 and 1570. The uncertainty concerning the date of the *Profecía del Tajo* prevents our affirming that any of the translations now extant were made before León's thirtieth year, and in the few cases in which it is possible to find any evidence of date the poems have belonged to the decade 1568-78, i.e. from his fortieth to his fiftieth year of age.

Las sirenas a Cherinto. This 'Cherinto' is quite unknown. He appears to have reached middle age, and León exhorts him, as later Grial, to exert himself to some worthy end. It is the sort of advice that Sánchez de las Brozas might have addressed to Luis de León. M. Coster, calling attention to the reminiscence of Lucretius in this poem, dates it tentatively by Lambinus' Lucretius published at Paris in 1564. Another edition by this scholar was issued in 1570, and would serve just as well, while previous to his issue there had been nine editions of the *De rerum natura*, the *princeps* dating from before 1486. A certain incoherence is what chiefly distinguishes this poem from those which we can securely refer to his best period, but it must have been composed after he had reached middle age.

La cana y alta cumbre. The reference to the battle of Poqueira (February 1569) as a recent occurrence causes this to be the earliest assured date in the canon of León's lyrics, original or translated.

Inspira nuevo canto. In this somewhat frigid ode an ingenious use is made of Macrobius' description of the descent of human souls from the Primum Mobile through the Spheres. M. Coster calls attention to Bartolomé Barrientos' *Brevissimæ in Somnium Scipionis Explanationes*, published at Salamanca in 1570. The date of Tomasina's birth (1570 or 1571) is no more than an inference.

No siempre es poderosa, Virtud hija del cielo, Imitación de Horacio Oda xii lib. II, A la avaricia, Qué vale cuanto vee I. The latter part of 1571 and the early spring of 1572 was the most active portion of León's poetical life, unless this title belong to the year 1577. The ode *No siempre es poderosa* is one of three directed to Don Pedro Portocarrero, and one of two which refer to his governorship of Galicia in 1571-80. Its purpose is, as I understand, to congratulate him on his appointment, despite the opposition of interested parties; but these congratulations are set forth in the guise of general principles, namely, that the upright man cannot be repressed for ever. This identification of promotion with merit is the same procedure as is followed in the ode *Virtud hija del cielo*. The objectivity of each poem is as marked as that of the other, and

there would be no reason to refer this one to León's experience in prison, were it not for a line that has been explained with more dexterity than verisimilitude. M. Coster called attention to the phrases 'por más que la fiera / del tigre ciñe un lado, / y el otro el basilisco emponzoñado' and 'a la sierpe, al tigre fiero.' He constructs the equation 'tigre' = 'león' = León de Castro, and therefore 'basilisco' = Bartolomé de Medina, León's principal enemies; and these inferences are adopted by Mr Bell in his article cited. It must be observed, however, that this will have been the only piece of personal abuse in all León's poetry, for such expressions as 'la envidia y la mentira' allude to the general body of his accusers and not to any individual. Nor was there any need to write 'tigre' if he really meant 'león,' and the identification of 'basilisco' is only valid if the other equation be established. M. Coster cites an anecdote from Gracián in which the text of *Psalm* xci (xc), 13: 'Super Aspidem et Basili(sc)um ambulabis, et conculcabis Leonem et Draconem' is a pun on Dr Aspa, Maestro Basilio, Fr Luis de León and Dr Mondragón; but this, though on the right track, does not explain the word 'tigre' and has nothing to do with Bartolomé de Medina or León de Castro. The tiger and basilisk, in fact, are a mere periphrasis in the Horatian manner for 'la maldad' and were suggested by both the sources of this poem, viz. *Odes*, III, iv and I, xxii. The former offered 'ut tuto ab atris corpore viperis / dormirem et ursis,' and the latter:

sive per Syrtes iter aestuosas,
sive facturus per inhospitalem
Caucasum vel quæ loca fabulosus
lambit Hydaspes.

León was already thinking of the snakes of Libya, and perhaps of the tigers of India, when he translated:

O vaya por la arena
ardiente de la Libia *ponzoñosa*,
o vaya por do suena
de Hidaspes la corriente fabulosa,
o por la tierra cruda,
de nieve llena y de piedad desnuda.

Horace offered him tigers and snakes in one line (*Ars Poetica*, 12), but he would read of them in connection with the just man in the Hebrew of *Psalm* xci, 13: 'sobre el tigre y el basilisco pisarás¹.'

¹ The Septuagint reads ἐν τῇ ἀσπίδι in this passage, which is adopted by the Vulgate and the Russian versions. The Hebrew is *shachal* (שַׁחַל), and Cipriano de Valera translates: 'sobre el león y el basilisco pisarás.' The same Hebrew word occurs in *Job*, iv, 10, and in his note on the next verse León writes: "'Tigre perece sin presa, e hijos de tigre se esparcen." Lo que decimos "tigre," podemos decir "león" también, porque la palabra

The hymn to heroic virtue, *Virtud hija del cielo*, is also addressed to Portocarrero on his appointment to the governorship, from which León may have conceived some ambitious hopes, soon to be shattered by persecution. It is remarkable for its background of epic thought, when it cites Hercules, the Cid, Apollo and Diana and Gonzalo de Córdoba, the Great Captain, and the lines 'o la traciána flecha / o la bola tudesca' were probably suggested by the campaign which ended at Lepanto on 7 October 1571. To that battle the words 'el mar con turca sangre hora bañada' in *Imitación de la Oda xii, lib. II* undoubtedly refer, and in addition to mentioning the Cid and the Great Captain, as in the previous poem, this *Imitación* alludes to the Emperor Charles V's triumph at Pavia, the discovery of the New World, the elusive 'Nise,' and the riches of the Portuguese Eastern Empire. The verse:

¿ Por dicha habrá tesoro
que a su rico cabello se compare,
aunque se junte el oro
que el indiano suelo engendra y pare
y cuanta pedrería
Ormuz a Portugal y Persia envía?

marks the point of departure of the ode *A la avaricia*, wrongly ascribed to 1580¹:

En vano el mar fatiga
la vela portuguesa, que ni el seno
de Persia ni la amiga
Maluca da árbol bueno,
que pueda hacer un ánimo sereno.
No da reposo al pecho,
Felipe, ni la India, ni la rara
esmeralda provecho,
que más tuerce la cara
cuanto posee más el alma avara.

The comparison is so close that *A la avaricia* is what determines the case of 'Persia' in the *Imitación* (nominative not dative), and the *Imitación* proves that 'la India' is a better reading than 'la mina' in *A la avaricia*,

es una misma con la de arriba.' The sentence is ambiguous, but we cannot suppose that a professed Hebraist like León could fail to note that verses 10 and 11 have no word in common in the Hebrew, and we must conclude that (defending the Vulgate 'tigris') he proposes that all Hebrew denominations for 'lion' may be translated indifferently 'tiger.' Hence, León's translation of *Psalms* xci, 13 was: 'sobre el tigre y el basilisco pisarás.' It would be more accurate to say, of course, that the Hebrew has no word for 'tiger,' because the great invasion of India by tigers occurred only in the time of Alexander the Great. A statement that a set of Hebrew words may be translated either 'lion' or 'tiger' is not as good as to say that the words are equivalent in Spanish, which M. Coster and Mr Bell require to prove.

¹ By M. Coster, on the ground that 'amiga' could not be applied to a Portuguese possession until the Union of Spain and Portugal in 1580.

and that 'la India' is a reference to gold. The same ideas and language open the poem *Qué vale cuanto vee*:

lo que el indio posee
lo que da el claro Oriente,
con todo lo que afana la vil gente,

from which it appears that 'indiano suelo,' 'la India' and 'el indio' refer specifically to Peru. These three poems, therefore, I hold to be written under one inspiration during the winter following the battle of Lepanto, except that *Qué vale cuanto vee* is a composite poem written at different eras, and that these remarks apply only to its first state comprising verses 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and perhaps 9.

B. *Poems of Persecution* (1572-6).

A la Ascensión. This poem was probably written on Ascension Day and its pictorial clearness of composition suggests, as Mr Bell has observed, that it was inspired by some painting of the Ascension. There is nothing, apart from its religious tone, to suggest the year in which this piece was written, but it undoubtedly belongs to the maturity of the poet's genius, and the ascription to 1572 is not improbable.

Huid contentos de mi pecho vanos. This is the bitterest cry in all León's writing. According to the rubric it refers to a 'hope that proved vain,' and this may have been the discovery that his signature was absent from all copies of the Vatable Bible, which is attested by a document dated 13 February 1574. This poem depicts for the first time the ideal of the Contemplative Life under the metaphor suggested by the *Georgics*, but without leisure. The style is everywhere singularly nervous and there is not so much description as succession of contrasts. M. Coster was at one time disposed to accept the ode on the Religious Life which commences with *Mil varios pensamientos* and to refer it to the year 1544, when León entered the order of St Augustine at the age of sixteen years, but by omitting it from the *Poésies Originales* he tacitly accepted the general opinion of students that this poem is of dubious ascription. It is just possible that León may have dallied with the idea of renouncing his professorial career and devoting himself to pure asceticism, and it is not likely that his superiors would encourage any such resolve either before or after his imprisonment, seeing that it would deprive them of a well-nigh invincible champion of their Order in any competition for University appointments. The writer, whoever he may be, is one who knows intimately the Salamancan technique and can approach very close to the authentic manner of our poet. He writes 'cercado de tor-

mentos / de pena y agonía,' which might signify a prison were we sure it is not metaphorical. The poem is ascribed to León by only one manuscript, that of Alcalá, and we have not sufficient cause to reject it altogether. If it should belong to our poet, it would best fit in with some date during the imprisonment, when we know that León had reason to probe his conscience and examine his manner of life.

Del Bembo, Virgen que el sol más pura, No viéramos el rostro al Padre Eterno, De Pindaro, A todos los santos. On 16 July 1575 León asked for his copy of Pindar and for the *Prose di Bembo*, the latter for the purpose of considering the arguments in favour of composing his *Nombres de Cristo* in the Spanish vernacular¹. The translation of Pindar's first Olympian ode is so felicitous and accurate that it is not easy to suppose it achieved apart from works of reference or apart from the advice of a professional student of Greek such as Sánchez de las Brozas. Occasional departures are made from the Greek, but as they are interesting poetry in themselves, their effect is both to maintain the strophic correspondence in León's version and to repair some of the losses caused by inability to reproduce Pindar's compound epithets. This rendering has the further advantage over some modern English versions in that it raises in the reader's mind quite comprehensible ideas. So he translates:

Χάρις δ', ἅπερ ἅπαντα τεύχει τὰ μέλιχα θνατοῖς

by 'Merced de la *poesía*, / que es la fabricadora / de todo lo que es dulce a los oídos,' which is much happier than 'Favour (to whom all earthly joys are due)' as being rather more accurate and much more intelligible. M. Coster conjectured that, after reading the first Olympian, León may have passed over to the second and thus may have been reminded of Horace's imitation 'Quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri / tibia sumis celebrare, Clio, / quem deum?' (*Odes*, I, xii), which inspires the ode *A todos los santos*. It is not certain whether the *Rime del Bembo* accompanied the *Prose* into León's cell, but as he was not able to understand Italian in or about 1569 and as the translation of Ballata V has a topical interest if executed in prison ('Tu, Padre ne mandasti / in questo mar, e tu ne scorgi a porto') we may suppose it to belong to this date. The translation *Del Bembo*, the ode *A todos los santos*, and the *Virgen que el sol más pura* are all poems of contrition in which León acknowledges his faults, and each contains some expression similar to Bembo's 'e 'l nostro torto / la tua pietà non vinca.' His 85th sonnet might recall to León's mind Petrarch's *Vergine bella che di Sol vestita* (Canzon 49) which inspires

¹ A. F. G. Bell, *Luis de León*, p. 230.

Virgen que el sol más pura. It is probable, therefore, that Bembo's ballata was translated in July or early August of 1575, *Virgen que el sol más pura* written for the festival of Our Lady of August (15 August 1575), and *A todos los santos*¹ for All Saints (1 November) of the same year. Nothing helps us to date *No viéramos el rostro al Padre Eterno*, which despite Quevedo and three manuscripts is considered doubtful by M. Coster on the ground that it is composed in octaves². A third ode to Our Lady, *De la hermosura de Nuestra Señora*, is not so well authenticated, and Menéndez y Pelayo thought it might be by Arias Montano. Generally speaking, the poems of persecution are recognisable as a group, but it is almost beyond the ingenuity of conjecture to assign them to exact dates.

C. *Portus Quietis* (1577-83).

Al salir de la cárcel, Cuán descansada vida, Al apartamiento, De Tibulo. The interrelation of these poems has already been discussed. León was acquitted on 11 December 1576 and entered Salamanca in triumph on 30 December. His *décima* thus belongs to December 1576 or very early in 1577. Shortly after this poem he drafted *Cuán descansada vida* which had probably reached its twelve-verse treatment by the spring of that year, and in spring or early summer he wrote the ode *Al apartamiento*. The translation of Tibullus, II, iii, may belong to this period as it has reference to 'la vida del campo.'

Imitación de Petrarca, Imitación de diversos, Nise sonnets. The first of these poems is an allegory of love in free imitation of Petrarch's 42nd canzon, but the opening verses, with their echo of a similar phrase in *Al apartamiento*, are original:

Mi trabajoso día
hacia la tarde un poco declinaba,
y libre ya del grave mal pasado,
las fuerzas recogía.

The date of the translations or imitations of Italian poets is determined by the circumstance that our poet hardly understood Italian in or about

¹ In this poem the 'Efrateo' who 'con fuerza y maña / del oso y del león domó la saña' is not St Jerome but David (1 *Samuel*, xvii, 34-37). 'Del sacro y verde Hermón por la ladera' may be a periphrasis for Palestine or it may be an incorrect deduction from *Deut.* iv, 48: 'hasta el monte de Sión que es Hermón,' seeing that in every other instance Sion is Jerusalem. 'En la desierta alteza / muerta luce tu vida y fortaleza' is not 'toi qui, dans les hauteurs désertes, mourus....,' since St Catherine was executed in Italy and her corpse was transferred to Mt Sinai.

² Coster, *Poésies Originales*, p. 56: 'Rien ne permet de fixer la date de cette poésie dont l'authenticité me semble fort douteuse. Elle est écrite en octaves, rythme que Luis de León ne semble pas avoir employé ailleurs.' He uses octaves for *Georgics*, I, and *Eclouges*, 2, 6, 7, 8, 10.

1569¹. While yet imprisoned he read Bembo and Petrarch and translated or imitated passages that were appropriate to his own condition, but it is not likely that he would at that time have cared to indulge in merely formal imitation of their style in erotic poetry. During the summer of 1577, however, free from the necessity of compiling voluminous replies to the accusations of his enemies and holding a supernumerary professorship, he must have had unusual leisure for poetry, composing these pieces as rhetorical exercises to be discussed by the friends who were accustomed to meet with him for the practice and criticism of verse. The *Imitación de Petrarca* is defined by its opening lines; the Nise sonnets are entirely Bemboesque, though no one has yet pointed to a precise Italian source; the *Imitación de diversos*, written in a national metre, contains a verse that depends on Bembo's *Ne l'odorato e lucido oriente* (stanza 42), as Menéndez y Pelayo already remarked². The sonnets in which no lady is named are of the same type as the two which name 'Nise.' They are very beautiful and have been highly praised, but it is well to remember that they are by a poet who had already written the *Descansada vida* and perhaps also *A Salinas*.

A Salinas, Cuando contemplo el cielo, Cuándo será que pueda, Alma región luciente, translations from Vergil, the Psalms and Job. A poem addressed to Francisco Salinas, Professor of Music at Salamanca, might have been written by León at any time after their acquaintance commenced in 1567, but M. Coster achieves something near to certainty when he connects this poem with the publication of Salinas' treatise *De musica* at Salamanca in 1577. The group of poems we are now studying share with those written immediately after the release an intense aspiration after philosophic retirement, though they are not marked by allusions that specifically envisage 'el grave mal pasado.' They have advanced, however, towards a new and more philosophic form of exposition, which embodies the ideas of Pythagoras and Plato as set forth in the *Timæus*, *Somnium Scipionis* and Macrobius' *Commentarius*. The intensive study of Macrobius which is evidenced by these poems may explain León's candidature for the Chair of Moral Philosophy in August 1578, and where appointments depended on a public display of one's powers, an eloquence similar to that of these pieces would indeed be irresistible. Their common framework is that of the aspiration of the philosophic soul to return to the region of real existences, which is located

¹ *Documentos inéditos*, x, p. 305: 'porque era en lengua toscana, la cual este no sabia entonces.'

² *Antología*, XIII, p. 332.

in the Empyrean and must be viewed from the Primum Mobile: 'hinc profecti, huc revertuntur.' The soul must be freed by right thinking from the trammels of the flesh, and its way lies through the eight planetary or starry spheres. These are detailed in *Cuando contemplo el cielo* as in the ode to Tomasina, the poems differing in that one is a poem of academic compliment and the other a personal philosophy. In *Cuándo será que pueda* the soul is detained for a while in the region of the clouds beneath the orbit of the Moon, and the other Spheres are cursorily alluded to ('los movimientos celestiales....Quién rige las estrellas....Veré este fuego eterno....Veré sin movimiento / en la más alta esfera las moradas'). The ode to Salinas is yet more brief and proportionately more happy. The transit occupies only two lines ('Traspasa el aire todo / hasta llegar a la más alta esfera') and the poet dwells longer amongst the Ideas. In this poem he makes use, as we have seen, of the Pythagorean doctrine of the Music of the Spheres, as detailed by Macrobius on the basis of the *Timæus* and *Republic* of Plato, and in an additional verse of great daring and beauty (also suggested by a text in Macrobius) he beholds God Himself through the liberating power of music:

But here is the finger of God, a flash of the will that can,
Existent behind all laws, that made them and lo, they are!¹

This ode *A Salinas* represents the high-water mark of León's poetry. Its emotion is less general than that of the *Descansada vida* and its thought less concentrated than *Del conocimiento de sí mismo*, but it is more economical than the former, more sensuous than the latter and its concepts are, even for León, singularly bold, lofty and soaring.

Cuándo será que pueda contains in full the famous description of a summer storm in *Georgics*, I, 320 sq. It is possible that what called León's attention to this passage was his own version of the first *Georgic*, though there is no verbal correspondence between the two renderings, apart from the fortuitous coincidence that both avoid the words 'Ipse Pater'; but there is nothing to constrain us to ascribe the translation of the *Georgic* to any other date than that of its most striking employment in León's original poetry. He was doubtless working alongside of Francisco de las Brozas, translator of the same *Georgic* into tercets, and Juan Grial as one of the 'viri doctissimi' who planned a recension of Vergil, a labour that received only partial completion in the year of

¹ Cp. L. de León, *Nombres de Cristo* (ed. Onís), II, pp. 133-4, and that editor's note on the theme of the *noche estrellada* in León's prose.

León's death¹. The same observation is pertinent to the reminiscence of *Psalm* civ embedded in this Vergilian simile. The complete translation of that Psalm may be found in *Nombres de Cristo*, I, viii. The gravity and majesty of that rendering belong to a poet in the full exercise of his splendid powers, and it is highly probable that the Biblical translations scattered over the *Nombres de Cristo* and *Exposición de Job* are not early works revised and adapted for the occasion but actually made for the passages in which they occur. From a modern point of view, it is natural to suppose that León advanced through imitation and translation towards the formation of his individual style; but it is equally or more probable that León formed his original style in order to translate the poetry of the Bible. In that case, the bulk of these versions belong to 1577-83. We have already seen that, although considerable time must have been devoted by the poet to Horace between 1560 and 1568, we cannot actually date any translation from that or any classical author until after the poet's fortieth year, nor any from the Italian until his forty-eighth. Despite the strange assertion of his preface that 'entre las ocupaciones de mis estudios en mi mocedad, y casi en mi niñez, se me cayeron como de entre las manos estas obrecillas,' we are bound to conclude that León was a late-flowering genius, unless there has been a wholesome destruction of the poems to which the preface may have been applicable. It appears to me that chronologically the translations of the *Psalms* and *Job* mark the transition from his matured original style to the labours of the commentator, which he considered to be his supreme duty and achievement. It is tempting to suppose that the brief paraphrase of the twenty-third Psalm which forms the second, third and fourth verses of *Alma región luciente* was written for the chapter entitled *Pastor* in *Nombres de Cristo* (I, vi), and it has already been shown that the chapter cited belongs to the same emotional conditions as the conclusions given to *Alma región luciente* and *Cuando contemplo el cielo*, which when we consider the relation of the latter to *A Salinas* can hardly be dated later than the winter of 1577-8.

Qué vale cuanto vee II, Del Mundo y su vanidad. That the latter is a genuine work of our poet, and that its date is fixed by allusions that come down to October 1578, has been shown by Mr Bell in the *Modern Language Review* for April 1926. We have already attempted to show that *Qué vale cuanto vee* is a composite poem belonging in its earliest form to the winter of 1571-2. It is not possible to say when the verses

¹ A. F. G. Bell, *El Brocense*, Oxford, 1925, p. 117: 'Constituerant viri quidam doctissimi mihique amicissimi ut quam correctissima Virgilii opera exouderentur.'

from Prudentius were added, but the simile from Horace clearly belongs to the later experiences of the poet. These two lyrics have as a common feature their rambling and uncertain construction, which may be attributable to the distraction of León's mind in the latter portion of 1578 by his candidature for the Chair of Moral Philosophy and by the necessity of preparing a course of lectures on a subject which he had never previously professed. A sonnet discovered by Sr Menéndez Pidal¹ was composed for Christmas of that year, and another possibly for the festival of Corpus Christi in a year not indicated.

Recoge ya en su seno. Addressed to Juan Grial, this poem urges him to complete some great work which is described in terms of poetry; the advice is, therefore, very similar to that offered to 'Cherinto,' but the style is much more mature and mellow. The time of year (autumn) is unmistakably indicated, but there is considerable difficulty in fixing the date. The last verse, adapted from Giovanni della Casa, refers to attacks made on our poet which have severed his connection with the Muses:

Que yo de un torbellino
traidor acometido, y derrocado
de en medio del camino
al hondo, el plectro amado,
y del vuelo las alas he quebrado.

It has been customary to refer the poem to 1578 and to explain these lines as an allusion to the persecution of 1572-6. But that liberation was followed not by silence but by a wonderful profusion of song. The language of the verse seems to me to refer to a persecution in the present and not in the past. The litigation concerning the Chair of Scripture which kept him away from Salamanca and from the circle of poets who met at La Flecha during half of the year 1579, did, in fact, interrupt his poetical career, and is a commentary adequate to this stanza. The same litigation occupied half his leisure in 1580; he was ineffectively denounced to the Inquisition for assuming the Horatian motto of the mountain oak (*Odes*, iv, iv) on 15 October 1580; and a theological dispute on Predestination placed León at the mercy of his opponents between 20 January and August 1582. On the whole, I prefer 1579 as being nearer to his other poems.

Canción del conocimiento de sí mismo. Only two manuscripts support the early editions in ascribing this poem to León, but the internal assurances are not to be gainsaid. This poem, perhaps on account of its abstract and highly intellectualised manner, has not been fully appreciated. In its form this preoccupation with intellectual interests causes

¹ R. Menéndez Pidal, *Estudios Literarios*, Madrid, s.a., pp. 166-7.

it to be almost the only poem by this author from which nothing can be subtracted with impunity. Each verse builds the foundations of the next, so that the poem is not a juxtaposition of stanzas but a strophic organism. The Platonic doctrines of 'reminiscence' and of the entrance of the soul into the body no longer grace an aspiration after repose which is at bottom Horatian; they are no longer ornamental but embedded in the poet's religion, and intricately interwoven with his ideas on original sin and saving grace. The movement of the poem is undoubtedly slow, for only after fifty-five lines does his autobiography reach his christening, which itself occupies an entire stanza. Then 'crecí después, y fuí en edad entrando, / llegué a la discreción con que debiera / entregarme a quien tanto había dado.' This expression is sufficiently vague. According to M. Coster's view León came to years of discretion considerably before the age of sixteen; for we must allow him some time to be as sinful as six stanzas declare him to be. M. Coster places his penitence and his abjuration of the world at the age of sixteen, when he entered the Augustinian Order in 1544. Ten years of virtuous living ('que aunque sané del mal y su accidente, / diez años ha que soy convaleciente') brings us to 1553-4 as the date of this poem. It would be strange if Luis de León could claim self-knowledge at the age of twenty-four. It is true that at thirty Confucius 'stood firm' in all his convictions, but it is on record that the other philosophers thought him a cockscomb! The title of this canzon is Platonic, and the Platonism of Macrobius' *Commentarius* (which M. Coster supposes to have been unknown to León before 1570) is thoroughly integrated in the thought of the poem, while the precise use of theological terms and their coherence in a philosophical system indicate a theologian of no small experience. Plainly the 'mal y su accidente' is not so juvenile as M. Coster thinks. From the ode *Al apartamiento*

(Y do está más sereno
el aire me coloca, mientras curo
los daños del veneno
que bebí mal seguro,
mientras el manchado pecho apuro;
Mientras que poco a poco
borro de la memoria cuanto impreso
dejó allí el vivir loco
por todo su proceso
vario entre gozo vano y casi avieso),

from the poems of 1575, and from sundry references in his prose works¹,

¹ Mr Bell quotes 'Ea enim tunc animi quiete atque lætitia fruebar quam nunc, luci redditus et amioissimorum mihi hominum consuetudine fruens, sæpe requiro' (*Luis de León*, p. 138).

we know that León took stock of his own life during his imprisonment, and that he found matter for censure. The passionate aspiration after retirement expressed by his greatest odes is not a withdrawal from duty but a cleansing of the heart from personal ambition and all forms of selfishness. This, then, is the spiritual crisis which occurred when our poet had reached the age of discretion, and this 'vivir loco' was what seemed to him to mar all his early professorial career. Reckoning, therefore, the ten years of spiritual convalescence from the beginning of his repentance while under duress, we reach the date 1582-3 for the present canzon. At the age of fifty-five years, conscious of his powers and his experience, instructed by human and divine philosophy, and about to pass from what he considered to be the trifles of poetry to the great religious tasks of life, being in fact on the point of realising those 'greater expectations' of Sánchez de las Brozas¹ and of his own conscience, León sums up his varied experience in the last accents of his poetry, where passion is no longer a thing of half-sensuous concepts, but of severe self-repression and a deep Lucretian glow. The *Canción del conocimiento de sí mismo* is, in some ways, the most remarkable of the lyrics of Fray Luis de León: a true chronology, I believe, makes it of capital importance for his biography.

W. J. ENTWISTLE.

GLASGOW.

¹ Sánchez, apud Gallardo, *Ensayo*, iv, no. 3829: 'el Autor es conocido, y no le pesará de que se imprima, aunque no consintirá que su nombre se divulgue en este caso, por ser hombre dotísimo, y de quien mucho más se espera.' Cf. L. de León, *Nombres de Cristo* (ed. Onís), iii, p. 7: 'los que esperavan mayores cosas de mí.'

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

'THE DEBATE OF THE SOUL AND THE BODY' IN MS. DIGBY 86.

It appears to have escaped notice that stanzas 28 to the end of the 'Debate of the Soul and the Body' in MS. Digby 86, that is, nearly two-thirds of the poem, are identical with the poems called 'Doomsday' and 'Death,' printed by Morris in the *Old English Miscellany*. The version of the Debate contained in the first 27 stanzas of the Digby poem is also found in MS. Harl. 2253, though with considerable verbal differences and variations in the order of lines and stanzas. The Digby poem is printed by Stengel, and the Harleian by Wright in *Latin Poems Attributed to Walter Mapes*, in stanzas of four lines, mono-rhymed. From a comparison of the two texts it is clear that internal rhyme also originally formed part of the metrical scheme, though in some lines it has been obscured owing to the words having been arranged in a wrong order, and in some others it is missing altogether. The Debate proper is followed by an account of the Seven Signs before Judgment in the same stanza, still showing traces of internal rhyme. From the end of this section the two texts cease to correspond in any particular, though each is still concerned with the general theme of death.

The next section in the Digby text, beginning at stanza 28, is identical with 'Doomsday,' but contains two additional stanzas, 38 and 39, and it is followed without a break, from stanza 41 to the end, by 'Death,' with the omission of its four opening stanzas. The complete absence of internal rhyme from stanza 28 to the end is itself an indication that 'Doomsday' and 'Death' did not originally form part of the Digby poem, although they are written in a very similar stanza. Moreover, 'Death' contains a distinct speech of the soul to the body, in which striking similarities to the 'Address of the Soul to the Body' in the twelfth-century Worcester Cathedral Fragments have more than once been pointed out.

BEATRICE ALLEN.

LONDON.

THE SOURCES OF SPENSER'S 'AMORETTI.'

The sources of Spenser's *Amoretti* have not received thorough investigation so far, but enough has been done to show that the poet owed something to foreign influence. There are some suggestions of borrowings

from Desportes¹. Of all the proofs brought forward of the influence of the Abbé de Thiron, probably the most convincing to the language-trained student is that afforded by the resemblance in theme and phrasing between *Amoretti*, xv:

Ye tradefull Merchants, that with weary toyle,
and *Diane* I, xxxii:

Marchands, qui recherchez tout le rivage more.

It has already been shown² that analogous poems exist in the Italian anthologies, and there is every likelihood that Spenser knew these collections. But the discovery made by Fitzmaurice-Kelly³ about thirty years ago that one sonnet of the *Amoretti* is completely translated from Torquato Tasso makes a greater impression on the student accustomed to translation from and into foreign languages. We may be pardoned for bringing the Italian and English once more to the notice of readers, because this translation has not received the attention it deserved.

Amoretti, LXXXI.

Fayre is my love, when her fayre golden heares,
with the loose wynd ye waving chance to marke:
fayre when the rose in her red cheekes appeares,
or in her eyes the fyre of love does sparke.

Fayre when her brest lyke a rich laden barke,
with pretious merchandize she forth doth lay:
fayre when that cloud of pryde, which oft doth dark
her goodly light with smiles she drives away.

But fayrest she, when so she doth display,
the gate with pearles and rubyes richly dight:
through which her words so wise do make their way
to beare the message of her gentle spright.

The rest be works of natures wonderment,
but this the worke of harts astonishment.

Tasso, *Rime*⁴, 14 (Pisa, 1821).

Commenda le bellezze della sua donna, e in specie la bocca.

Bella è la donna mia, se del bel crine
L' oro al vento ondeggiar avvien ch' io miri,
Bella, se volger gli occhi in vaghi giri,
O le rose fiorir tra neve e brine.

E bella, dove poggi, ove s' inchina;
Dov' orgoglio l' inaspra a' miei desiri,
Belli sono i suoi sdegni, e quei martiri,
Che mi fan degno d' onorato fine.

¹ Cp. L. E. Kastner, *Spenser and Desportes*, *Mod. Lang. Review*, iv, pp. 65 ff.

² By Prof. Berdan of Yale; cp. F. J. Carpenter, *Reference Guide to E. Spenser*.

³ Cp. Carpenter, *op. cit.*

⁴ Vol. II, p. 25 (Solerti).

Ma quella, ch' apre un dolce labro, e serra,
 Porta di bei rubin sì dolcemente,
 È beltà sovra ogn' altra altera ed alma.

Porta gentil della prigion dell' alma,
 Onde i messi d' Amor escon sovente,
 E portan dolce pace, e dolce guerra.

This is a summary account of the most interesting work hitherto accomplished on the *Amoretti*. Further research enables us to make some additions to our knowledge of the sources. Of all the foreign sonneteers who influenced Spenser, the most important is undoubtedly Torquato Tasso. Three complete sonnets, of which one has already been quoted, are translations from the Italian. The other two are as follows:

Amoretti, LXXII¹.

Oft when my spirit doth spred her bolder winges,
 In mind to mount up to the purest sky:
 it down is weighd with thoght of earthly things
 and clogd with burden of mortality,

Where when that soverayne beauty it doth spy,
 resembling heavens glory in her light:
 drawne with sweet pleasures bayt, it back doth fly,
 and unto heaven forgets her former flight.

There my fraile fancy fed with full delight,
 doth bath in blisse and mantleth most at ease:
 ne thinks of other heaven, but how it might
 her harts desire with most contentment please.

Hart need not with none other happinesse,
 but here on earth to have such hevens blisse.

Tasso², 47 (Pisa, 1821).

Ritorno dal cielo alla sua donna.

L' alma vaga di luce e di bellezza,
 Ardite spiega al Ciel l' ale amorose;
 Ma sì le fa l' umanità gravose,
 Che le dechina a quel, ch' in terra apprezza.

E de' piaceri alla dolce esca avvezza,
 Ove in sereno volto Amor la pose
 Tra bianche perle e mattutine rose,
 Par che non trovi altra maggior dolcezza.

E fa quasi augellin, ch' in alto s' erga,
 E poi discenda alfin ov' altri il cibi;
 E quasi volontario s' imprigioni.

E fra tanti del Ciel graditi doni,
 Sì gran diletto par che in voi delibi,
 Ch' in voi solo si pasce, e solo alberga.

¹ Spenser keeps very close to Tasso at the beginning.

² Vol. II, p. 98 (ed. Solerti).

Amoretti, LXXIII.

Being my selfe captived here in care,
 My hart, whom none with servile bands can tye,
 but the fayre tresses of your golden hayre,
 breaking his prison forth to you doth fly.
 Lyke as a byrd that in ones hand doth spy
 desired food, to it doth make his flight:
 even so my hart, that wont on your fayre eye
 to feed his fill, flies backe unto your sight.
 Doe you him take, and in your bosome bright,
 gently encage, that he may be your thrall:
 perhaps he there may learne with rare delight,
 to sing your name and prayses over all.
 That it hereafter may you not repent,
 him lodging in your bosome to have lent.

Tasso¹, 167 (Pisa, 1821).

Alla sua donna lontana.

Donna, poichè fortuna empia mi nega
 Seguirvi, e cinge al piè dure catene;
 Almen per le vostre orme il cor ne viene,
 Cui laccio, oltre i bei crini, altro non lega.
 E fa quasi augellin, che l' ali spiega
 Dietro ad uom, che dolce esca in man ritiene,
 Che di cibarsi ne' vostri occhi ha spene,
 E questa è la cagion ch' ognor vi sega.
 Prendetel voi, e dentro al vostro seno
 Riponetel benigna, e quivi poi
 Felice prigioniero i giorni spenda.
 Forse avverrà, che i dolci affanni suoi
 Canti, e 'l bel vostro nome, e 'l suono intenda,
 Quanto cingon d' intorno Adria, e Tirreno.

Amoretti, LXXII, is worthy of attention. It is noted as indicating Spenser's 'inner feelings².' The sonnet probably does express Spenser's feelings, because by the use of the possessive '*my spirit*,' he has made it quite his own, but it is curious to see that the feelings were originally Tasso's.

This does not exhaust Spenser's debt to Tasso. Sonnets LXXVI and LXXVII are to be compared with Tasso, 134, *Il seno di madonna*, where we likewise find the apples of Atalanta and of the Hesperides, and where the general idea in English and Italian is the same. The first quatrain of *Amoretti, LXXXIV*:

Let not one sparke of filthy lustfull fyre
 breake out, that may her sacred peace molest:

is modelled on Tasso's 137 (Pisa, 1821):

¹ Vol. II, p. 319 (ed. Solerti).

² Carpenter, *op. cit.*; cp. also Professor Erskine's praise of this sonnet in *The Elizabethan Lyric*.

L' amor lascivo e non l' onesto debbe celarsi.

Uom di non pure fiamme acceso il core,
Che lor ministra esca terrena immonda,
Chiuda il suo foco in parte ima e profonda,
E non risplenda il torbido splendore.

The subjunctive 'chiuda' rendered by 'Let,' etc., does not permit us to doubt that here we have Spenser's starting-point, however much he modifies the latter part of the sonnet. *Amoretti*, iv, apparently contains reminiscences of various spring poems, Du Bellay's *Du 1^{er} jour de l'an*, Lucretius' invocation to Venus, and a short lyric of Tasso's (II, p. 289, ed. Solerti):

ride la terra, e 'l Ciel d' intorno
E di bel manto adorno...
Di giacinti, e viole il Pò si veste.

Spenser's sonnet runs:

For lusty spring...
warnes the Earth with divers colord flowre
to decke hir selfe, and her fair mantle weave.

The peculiar construction of sonnet LVI, where each quatrain begins:

Fayre be ye sure, but...

is after the type of stanzas of Tasso's (iv, p. 69, ed. Solerti):

Voi sête bella, ma...

each stanza commencing in the same way.

The concluding sonnet of Spenser's sequence bears some resemblance to another Italian poem¹. It might be objected that here we have a Petrarchan *cliché*, that the dove had come down as a model of fidelity from the ancients. It is true that there are half-a-dozen foreign sonnets of the same type as Spenser's, and Spenser may have read them all. His familiarity with Tasso, however, suggests this author as probably a more likely model than any of the others.

I have quoted most of the important examples of translation and resemblance between Spenser and Tasso. The influence of Tebaldeo, Serafino and Bembo is slighter, though Spenser read these also. Petrarch occasionally furnished the phrasing, and is here, as in any sonneteer of the Renaissance, the source of many of the themes. Other sonnets, again, derive from the natural history of the time, which Lyly found so useful for his figures of speech more than ten years before Spenser—the lion, 'kind to yielded prey,' the panther, whose spotted hide pleased 'all beasts,' the cuckoo, which (strange to say) was thought to be a

¹ Tasso, II, p. 439 (ed. Solerti).

type of vanity and boasting, because it continually repeated its own name. These sonnets are among the most curious in the sequence.

A tabulation of sources will be convenient for reference. The sonnets given for comparison are not translated or imitated in the English in every case. Some of the foreign sonnets are analogous poems, and throw light on the English. It would be possible to cite Italian or French poems of the same type other than Tasso's in several instances, but, taking Spenser's close acquaintance with Tasso's work into consideration, the probabilities are in favour of a debt to Tasso. This debt may be merely in some cases the force of Tasso's example. It is nevertheless a debt.

Amoretti.

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| II | For viper cp. Bartholomaeus Anglicus: <i>De Proprietatibus Rerum</i> , lib. xviii. |
| III ¹ | Cp. Tasso, II, p. 52 (ed. Solerti): 'Veggio quando tal vista.' |
| IV | Cp. Du Bellay ² , <i>Vers lyriques</i> , VI (1549); Tasso, II, p. 289: 'Felice primavera.' |
| { V | Cp. Tasso, II, p. 54 (Solerti): 'Questa rara bellezza.' |
| { XXI ³ | Tasso, II, p. 115 (Solerti): 'Qualhor madonna' (effect of lady's eyes on lover); Tasso, 355 (Pisa), <i>Amor casto</i> : 'Non regna brama.' |
| XII | Phrasing, cp. Petrarch, III, XXI (ed. Salani, 1925). |
| XIII | Cp. Tasso, II, p. 316 (Solerti): 'Quell' alma.' |
| XVI | Phrasing, cp. Petrarch, III. |
| XVIII ⁴ | Serafino, Sonnet 117 (ed. 1548). |
| XX | Cp. Bartholomaeus, lib. xviii; Tebaldeo, 90 (1550). |
| XXII ⁵ | Cp. Tasso, 166 (Pisa): <i>Amor casto</i> . |
| XXV | Phrasing, Petrarch ⁶ , cxxxiv, Canzone 20, v. 88. |
| XXVII | First quatrain, cp. Horace, <i>Odes</i> , IV, x; innumerable analogies. |
| XXVIII | { Cp. Ronsard, <i>Astrée</i> , XI. |
| XXIX | |
| XXXI | Cp. Desportes, <i>Cléonice</i> , 74, and its source P. Sasso: 'Perche el sordo aspe.' |
| XXXVI | Phrasing, cp. Petrarch, XXI. |
| XLII | First and second quatrains, Tebaldeo, 35: 'Si dolce è la passion.' |
| XLIII | Cp. Tasso, Nos. 164, 166 (Solerti): 'Vuol che l' ami costei,' 'Se taccio il duol s' avanza.' |
| XLV | First quatrain, Tebaldeo ⁷ , 36. Third quatrain, cp. Tasso, 109 (Pisa). |
| { XLVII | Cp. Tasso, No. 88, Vol. II (Solerti): 'M' apre talor madonna' (Beauty and Cruelty). |
| { XLIX | Cp. Tasso, No. 74, Vol. II (Solerti): 'O più crudel.' |

¹ The poet's awe in presence of the beloved is as old as love poetry itself. Sappho expresses it, and her poem was often imitated at the Renaissance. Petrarch expresses the same feeling.

² The resemblance may be a coincidence, due to the season.

³ The Platonic sonnets of the *Amoretti* all contain favourite ideas of Tasso's. This poet was therefore one of the sources of the Platonism of Spenser's sonnets.

⁴ Professor Kastner gives Desportes, *Hipp.* 51, as source. Serafino is perhaps closer. The ultimate source of this type of sonnet is in such passages as Ovid, *Trist.* IV, VI, 1-16.

⁵ Desportes, *Diane*, I, 43, given by Kastner, is an analogous poem. The habit of writing such sonnets is probably to be traced to the example of Chariteo, who translated a passage in Virg. *Georg.* III, 13 ff., applying it to his lady. The type is common.

⁶ 'Hope and fear' was of course part of sonneteering vocabulary and may not come directly from Petrarch.

⁷ Desportes, *Hipp.* 18, imitates Tebaldeo

- LIII Cp. Bartholomaeus, lib. xviii.
 LIV Cp. Tasso, No. 712, Vol. III (Solerti): 'Riede la stagion lieta,' from second quatrain.
 LVI Tasso, No. 1022, Vol. iv (Solerti): 'Voi sête bella.'
 LVII Phrasing, cp. Petrarch, xxi, LXXXVI.
 LXV For bird cp. Tebaldeo, 39, and Sasso, *passim*.
 LXVII Cp. Tasso, II, p. 429 (Solerti): 'Questa fera gentil.'
 LXXVIII¹ The Bible.
 LXX Closing couplet, cp. *F.Q.* II, xii, 75, and its source Tasso, *G.L.*, xvi, 15.
 LXXII Tasso, II, p. 98 (Solerti): 'L' alma vaga.'
 LXXIII Tasso, II, p. 319 (Solerti): 'Donna, poichè fortuna.'
 LXXVI } Tasso, III, p. 133 (Solerti): 'Non son si belli.'
 LXXVII }
 LXXIX Cp. Tasso, III, p. 142 (Solerti): 'Vergine illustre.'
 LXXX Steed, Virg. *Aen.* xi, 492.
 LXXXI Tasso, II, p. 25 (Solerti): 'Bella è la donna mia.'
 LXXXIV Tasso, II, p. 194 (Solerti): 'Uom di non pure fiamme.'
 LXXXV Cuckoo², cp. Aldrovandi, *Ornith.*, lib. v, p. 424.
 LXXXVIII For day and night cp. *Astrophel and Stella*, 89.
 LXXXIX Cp. Tasso, II, p. 439 (Solerti): 'O vaga tortorella.'

JANET G. SCOTT.

GLASGOW.

JANE EYRE'S 'IRON SHROUD.'

In the thirty-fourth chapter of *Jane Eyre*, Jane, dominated for the time by St John Rivers and feeling herself pressed, step by step, towards a marriage against which all her true instincts rebel, expresses her anguished and paralysed reluctance in the following strange figure: 'My iron shroud contracted round me; persuasion advanced with slow sure step.' The metaphor belongs to a type which is very common with Charlotte Brontë, in which the idea of mental suffering is conveyed in the terms of violent and even fantastic physical pain. In *Villette* especially there are comparisons which for their abrupt vivid horror are like cries wrenched from a stoic by the rack. Lucy Snowe speaks of 'cutting injuries and insults of serrated and poison-dripping edge³, of gnawing a file to satisfy hunger and drinking brine to quench thirst⁴, and describes her repressed longing for release in the shape of Sisera, turning on the nail 'with a rebellious wrench⁵.' Many of these images are, like the last, elaborations of Scripture; Jane Eyre's contracting shroud, however, is drawn from literature of a different kind. It is, I believe, a direct allusion to a story called *The Iron Shroud* by William Mudford, which appeared in *Blackwood's Magazine* for August 1830.

¹ Lee gives Desportes, *Diane*, II, 46, as the source. Spenser quotes *Judges* v, 12, *Ephes.* iv, 8 in 'captivity captive,' and paraphrases other well-known passages in the rest of the sonnet. Cp. *Acts* iii, 15; *Rom.* vi, 9; *1 Cor.* xv, 55, 56, 57; *Rev.* i, 5, v, 9, vii, 14; *John* xv, 12; *Ephes.* v, 2; *1 John* iv, 19.

² The 'merry cuckoo' (xix) is different, belonging to spring songs. Cp. 'Sumer is icumen in.'

³ See *Villette*, ch. xxii.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ch. xxiv.

⁵ *Ibid.*, ch. xii.

The Iron Shroud is a tale of terror; it plays in mediæval Sicily and tells how 'the young, the brave, the proud Vivenzio' is consigned by his enemy to a prison, of which the 'portals never opened twice upon a living captive.' It is a dungeon hewn out of the solid rock, lined with walls of smooth black iron and pierced by a range of seven grated windows. Vivenzio is left in utter solitude, for his food is conveyed to him secretly without the appearance of a warder; and presently he realises that his prison is diminishing in size. Each day, by some mechanical device, the walls contract, the roof sinks and one window disappears. Vivenzio now perceives that the days of his life are numbered by the windows of his prison, and the rest of the story is devoted to the description of his mental agony under the slow advance of death. On the last day his iron bed, by the operation of some springs, takes on the appearance of a bier. 'The air seemed thick, and he breathed with difficulty; or it might be that he fancied it was so from the hot and narrow limits of his dungeon, which were now so diminished that he could neither stand up nor lie down at his full length.' At last an iron bell, with crashing vibration, begins to toll near at hand, the iron walls shake, and the author, who has hitherto concentrated on Vivenzio's mental state, assaults the reader's imagination with one hideous picture of physical torment. 'His body shook violently—he was bent nearly double. His hands rested upon either wall, and his feet were drawn under him to avoid the pressure in front.' The bell continues to toll; the walls move. 'He was horribly crushed by the ponderous roof and collapsing sides—and the flattened bier was his *Iron Shroud*.'

We know that the Brontë family took in *Blackwood's*. Branwell, in a letter to the editor (December 1835), says that in his childhood it formed his chief delight, and Charlotte, writing to her brother (17 May 1831), when *Blackwood's* had been (apparently temporarily) replaced by *Fraser's* in the Brontë household, sympathises with him over the change. There is every likelihood that she read the *Iron Shroud*. She was then fourteen years old, with a sensitive and highly developed imagination, and, as the horrible theme of the story is treated with enough literary skill to make it impressive, it probably lingered in her mind, along with other Gothic and German stuff, which was congenial to her fancy even when her critical reason disapproved it¹. Moreover, the story of Vivenzio would have the better chance of survival in that it concerns a prisoner, and the figure of the prisoner, real or metaphorical, occurs constantly in the work of both Charlotte and Emily Brontë.

¹ Cp. *Shirley*, ch. xxiii. Caroline criticises *The Italian*. It is attractive, she says, but ends in 'disappointment, vanity and vexation of spirit.'

A further point of interest is the use to which the sensational material is put. It appears robbed of its grosser horrors, in a metaphorical, spiritualised form. This procedure was characteristic of Charlotte Brontë's morbid and energetic genius. One suspects that a good many of her images of pain were influenced by recollections of scenes of torment in the tales of terror; but of this there is no convincing proof. When, however, the night listens to Robert Moore's confession 'like a black priest to a blacker penitent¹,' we are certainly on the track of the Gothic Romance, though it is, perhaps, hardly necessary to trace the image to the sub-title of Mrs Radcliffe's *The Italian, or the Confessional of the Black Penitents*, mentioned a few chapters before. Unlike the iron shroud, this sort of Gothic imagery is too general to need a specific source. But by far the most striking and perfect example of this transmutation of crude sensationalism to serve the ends of art occurs in connexion with the burial of Dr John's letters by Lucy Snowe. They are placed at the foot of a tree where, according to legend, a nun was once buried alive. The Gothic novelists had been much occupied with such living burials, and Scott, who took many suggestions from them, had used the theme in *Marmion*. Charlotte Brontë handled it on two planes. Taken literally, it provided the house in the Rue Fossette with a mock-ghost to work on the nerves of Lucy Snowe and the conscience of M. Paul Emanuel; taken metaphorically, it becomes the poignant symbol of Lucy's buried love:

Was this feeling dead? I do not know, but it was buried. Sometimes I thought the tomb unquiet, and dreamed strangely of disturbed earth, and of hair, still golden and living, obtruded through coffin-chinks².

The alchemy is complete; terror is merged in beauty.

J. M. S. TOMPKINS.

LONDON.

A SECOND VISIT TO GONDALIAN³.

When I wrote my last paper I used the 1910 edition of the *Complete Poems of Emily Brontë*, and I was not even aware that a second edition had been published in 1923, very carefully edited by C. W. Hatfield. On referring to the new edition I find that Mr Hatfield has studied the handwriting of the Brontës, and definitely attributes all the poems containing Angrian allusions to Charlotte and Branwell, sometimes separately, sometimes in collaboration. The only value which remains to my paper therefore is to

¹ See *Shirley*, ch. xxx.

² *Villette*, ch. xxxi.

³ See *Mod. Lang. Review*, xxi, p. 373.

show the connexion between these poems and the stories published in *The Twelve Adventurers*. I was not, as I supposed, discussing the poems of Emily Brontë.

The poems actually written by Emily, which I had mistakenly connected with the Angrian cycle, are as follows:

(1) The lines beginning 'O between distress and pleasure,' a slight piece with no distinctive features.

(2) Some disconnected, fragmentary verses, in which nothing is clear but that they are laments. Among these, however, is the long passage beginning 'And now the house-dog stretched once more,' which both in subject and metre is so like the poem beginning 'Ladybird, ladybird, fly away home' that I am surprised to find that they do not form part of the same whole. The explanation must be that Emily in the first-named, and Charlotte and Branwell in the 'Ladybird' poem were writing in close imitation of Sir Walter Scott's poems, especially *Marmion*.

(3) The lines beginning 'The soft unclouded blue of air.' This was a poem which I connected with *Wuthering Heights*, and I am interested to see that it is in fact by Emily.

Thus I may have the satisfaction of thinking that I picked out the Angrian poems with but few mistakes. Mr Hatfield considers the attribution of the song beginning 'On its bending stem a bonny flower' to Emily to be doubtful. It certainly seems to belong to the Angrian cycle. He silently drops the poem 'To the Horse Black Eagle, that I rode at the Battle of Zamorna.' He states that the poem beginning 'Far, far is mirth withdrawn' is by Emily, but that in the line 'On cursed Zamorna's howling plain,' the word *Zamorna* is a misreading for *Gomorra*, and the reference is Biblical, not Angrian.

My attention was drawn to the 1923 edition of the *Poems* by Mr Davidson Cook's interesting article in the August number of *The Nineteenth Century and After* on the newly discovered manuscript of some of Emily Brontë's poems. If his suggestion of a new edition is adopted, I would put in a plea for its arrangement in such a way that the Gondal poems may stand together and be grouped so as to show the different cycles of stories. We already have the poems in chronological order in Mr Hatfield's edition. To most readers the Gondal poems appear a complete mystery, and I feel sure they would be more appreciated if they were printed in a more comprehensible way, and perhaps with a few words of explanation.

MADELEINE HOPE DODDS.

GATESHEAD.

OLD FRENCH 'EN AINES.'

In the October number of the *Review*, Mr Waters in a very interesting article suggests an explanation of this rare Old French expression which occurs in the *Saint Brendan* in the description of the sword hanging at the gate of Paradise: 'En aines pent e turniēt.'

According to Mr Waters, who sees in *aines* the modern French word for 'groin,' *pendre en aines* originally meant 'to hang between the groins, to dangle.' The explanation is ingenious, but unsatisfactory for the following reasons: (1) *en* is not *entre*; (2) the sword which hangs before the gates does not 'dangle,' it 'whirls' (*turniēt*); (3) the theory has to be greatly strained to account for the expression *soutenir comme en aines*, used of tall soldiers holding shorter ones aloft when crossing a deep stream (*v. Tobler*); and (4) entirely breaks down in *Tobler's* other example: *En aines est, li cuers li faut*, said of a lady swooning. (5) In a fifth example which I am able to add to Mr Waters' list, the explanation seems just as inadequate. It is from the *Roman de Thèbes*. The archbishop Amphiaraius has just been swallowed up by the earth, much to the dismay of King Adrastus and his lords. The king calls a council and asks his barons whether, after this catastrophe, they wish to give up the siege and return to Greece. The Duke of Mycenæ replies exhorting him to depart, and begins his speech by saying, as far as I am able to reconstruct the passage, which has been rather badly handled in the critical edition:

Coment serions ci en aines,
Pues que nos vient tal aventure
Que terre nos fait a vœure!¹

It will be agreed, however we may interpret the first line of this passage, that here *en aines* can scarcely be *in inguinas*. (6) In the example from Adgar's *Legends of the Virgin Mary*, mentioned by Mr Waters, the author himself gives us what seems to be an exact definition of the

¹ Vv. 4988-90 of the *Anciens Textes* edition. The editor prints: 'Por quei serion ci en vaines, Pues que nos vient tal aventure Que la terre nos fait enjure.' As so frequently happens with critical editions, the correct reading is to be sought for among the variants. They are as follows: l. 1, *A* Por coi ferres vous chi en vaines, *P* Questiens nous chi quis en vaines, *D* Coment serai ci ennanes, *B* and *C* Com serion ici en emes (*C* enes), *S* Por quei sofron ci si granz paines. 2, as above, with minor variants. 3, *ABC* Que terre fet (*A* fist) contre nature, *D* Que terre nos fait aveue, *S* Que la terre nos fait enjure; lines 2 and 3 are missing in *P*. For line 1, according to the editor's own classification of the MSS., the agreement of *D*, the oldest of the *Thèbes* MSS., with *BC* demanded the introduction of *en aines* into the text. As for line 3, the word *vœure*, which I deduce from *D*'s version, is a unique example of a noun derived from O.F. *vêr*, so frequently used in expressions like *vêr une porte, une entrée*. The rime word for *aines* is *Miceines*; the author of *Thèbes* does not distinguish between *ein* and *ain*.

expression in the sense in which he uses it. He says of a miraculous veil which at certain times floats above an image of the Virgin:

Dunc se lieue li ueilz a munt,
E pent, ke ne seiuent par unt:
Vltre l'ymage en eïnes pent, . . .
Tient en halt uers le air sun estage
Ke l'en ueit bien tut l'ymage.

Line 3 of this passage seems to be a paraphrase of line 2, and *pendre en eïnes* to mean *pendre ke ne seiuent par unt*, in other words 'to hang in the void' or, to use a trite phrase, 'without visible means of support'; 'to dangle' would be here quite out of place.

The origin of the expression in all its uses is to be sought in the Latin word *vanum*, O.F. *vain*. Those who are startled by the heterodoxy of this phonology I would refer to an article by the present writer, published in this *Review* (Vol. XIX, pp. 45-47), upon the sound-changes at the back of certain etymologies of Mr Nicholson's, of which the expression *en aïnes* forms a welcome confirmation. *En aïnes* means firstly, 'in the void,' 'in space,' a meaning which satisfies the examples of *pendre en aïnes*, and *soutenir comme en aïnes*, and which is identical with the use of *en vain* in the following example which I take from Godefroy: 'La terre ne peut estre attachee a chenes en hault, ne desoubz n'a pilier qui la soustienne, *mais est pendue en vain*, et Dieu la soustient.' It means, secondly, 'in suspense,' in the figurative sense, which gives us the key to the passage from *Thèbes*, where two of the MSS. give us *en vaines*.

It means, thirdly, 'physically weak and faint,' a meaning which is one of the commonest of those possessed by the word *vain* in Old French; cp.

Si revint mes sire Gauvains
De pasmoïsons *mout mas et vains*,

and the frequent expressions *pâle et vain*, *foible et vain*, etc.

En aïnes is therefore an *en vain*, and represents a fragment of a very early and almost entirely submerged stratum of French phonology. As to the ending *-es*, it is the ending found in so many O.F. adverbs, and is no more or no less legitimate than the *-es* of *aparmaines* for *aparmain*, which is a form well attested in the texts. The fuller form *en aïnes* has ousted an earlier **en (h)ain* (in collision with *ain* < *hamum*), a vestige of which I see, used in the figurative meaning of *en aïnes*, in the expression *en l'ain* (spelt *aim*) of which one example is to be found in Godefroy:

Or sui *en l'aim* de morir ou de vivre
Se n'ai secours de cou ke plus desire;

and possibly also, in a degenerate form, in these two lines from Froissart, quoted by Godefroy, where the editor of the poems sees, quite unjustifiably, an offshoot of the verb *esmer* < *aestimare*:

J'en sui si plains d'ire
Que droit *sur l'ain* de marvoier¹.

JOHN ORR.

MANCHESTER.

Professor Orr's additional example of *en aines* is welcome, and I trust that others may yet be forthcoming. To the objections raised against the explanation put forward in the October number I would briefly reply (1) that the author of the Picard version of the *Brendan* wrote *Es aines pent*, apparently connecting the expression with *ai(s)ne* 'groin,' (2) that in v. 1717 of the *Brendan* the sword 'dangles' as well as 'whirls,' (3) that in the passage from Guillaume Guiart the shorter soldiers are presumably supported above by the taller soldiers, their legs however dangling in the water below, (4), (5) that *estre en aines* 'to be without support,' 'to be in suspense,' in *Amadas* and *Thèbes* may perfectly well be a metaphorical use of *estre en aines* 'to be suspended, dangle,' and (6) that in the example from Adgar the words *en eines pent* 'it hangs suspended' are not necessarily identical in meaning with *pent*, *ke ne seivent par unt*—why indeed should the poet repeat himself in successive lines? But though my suggestion may be defended as plausible, it certainly requires further evidence in order to be convincing.

The proposal to derive *en aines* from Lat. *vanum* will appeal only to those who accept Mr Nicholson's method of determining sound-changes. That initial *v* could become aspirated and disappear in pre-literary French is an arbitrary hypothesis, based solely upon unproved and far-fetched etymologies.

E. G. R. WATERS.

OXFORD.

¹ In Mr Waters' second article (Vol. xxii, pp. 28-43) I would suggest the elimination of the following words: *Cuntresailir*. There is no need to consider this as a hitherto unrecorded compound: the line should be read: 'Li venz lur est cuntre sailiz.' *Guerre*. The 'new' meaning given to this word, 'confusion, medley,' cannot be substantiated. In the opening lines of the poem the expression *tante guerre* is found with its normal meaning in O.F., and this meaning is most satisfactory in ll. 1047-8; for the author continues: 'Peissuns veum granz e cruels'; and as he goes on to say that they had never heard of the like before, it is the *guerre* which clearly calls forth the descriptive *cruels*. *Sorpeis*, *surpeis*, translated by Mr Waters as 'overload, excessive trouble,' is really two words and means 'against his will.' *Nel* cannot be a contraction for *ne* plus the dative, as Mr Waters' translation implies; *le* (in *Nel*) is object of *fat*, which has the same subject as *out*, viz. 'the otter.' Numerous examples of *sur son pois* are to be found in Godefroy; cp. also *sur le pois* in: 'Li pueples qui estoit remes a Marram sur le pois l'evesque d'Albare qui mout leur defendoit.'

REVIEWS

The Chaucer Tradition. By AAGE BRUSENDORFF. Copenhagen: P. P. Branner; London: H. Milford. 1925. 510 pp. and 5 plates. 18s.

The purpose of the author has been to examine the way in which the knowledge of Chaucer's personality and writings was handed down by the first two generations of the fifteenth century, in order to show that our information, scrappy though it is, represents a fully authoritative tradition, which yields some important biographical facts about the poet and offers the sole reliable basis for a true bibliographical canon of his work. Accordingly the main problems concerning Chaucer are indicated and dealt with, and an immense amount of bibliographical matter examined, by the well-equipped Danish scholar, whose natural penetration has been perfected through Professor Jespersen's teaching. A survey of this kind is welcome in the case of Chaucer, and our gratitude to Professor Brusendorff would be still higher, had he only shown in sifting the critical literature the same courage he exhibits in suggesting emendations for Chaucer's text.

If Chaucer has suffered much at the hand of copyists, he has suffered more through the misguided zeal of scholars and would-be scholars. We sigh to be relieved of the weight of much either useless or positively harmful fungous criticism contained in doctoral dissertations, from the burden of futile articles and notes scattered in dozens of periodicals, lest that machine devised for our use, Bibliography, should Robot-wise turn itself against its devisers and crush them under its stupid mass. Why does Dr Brusendorff pair the insignificant contribution or the crazy hypothesis of some young 'Ph.D.' with the authoritative work of a well-known scholar? Why does he fail to warn the reader as to the comparative value of the authorities he refers to? Since he has undergone the unpleasant task of reading everything touching his subject, why does he not listen to the voice of Charity, beseeching him to save his successors the same ordeal? I wish he had courageously added an Appendix D, to condemn explicitly to a well-deserved oblivion at least three-quarters of the items with which he studiously crams his footnotes. Owing to the remorseless output of critical literature on the greatest authors men are forced nowadays into a petty specialisation, with the pitiful result of whole lives devoted to clearing away rubbish. Such a task ought to be undertaken now and again, but never repeated till there has been a fresh accumulation. If it is impossible to forbid blockheads to print, let us, at least, judge them severely, and blot out reference to their work from future bibliographies. Specialisation will also become a Sisyphean task.

Dr Brusendorff's skill in emending corrupt passages is immense. Once the method admitted, his ingenuity cannot but deserve the highest

praise. May I venture to say that in most cases his clever guesses seem to me to partake of the nature of puzzles and similar *tours de force*? A method which is pretty safe in a narrow range proves unwarranted whenever, not single words, but whole sets of lines have to be recast and restored. Metrical schemes seem to afford a fairly reliable basis whereon to reconstruct a lost text: still all attempts at rewriting, say, Pindar's second strophe of the Sixth Pæan are doomed to be reckoned amongst curiosities rather than examples of true philological method. Archæologists of to-day have given up reconstructions of missing limbs of antique statues; why do not philologists give up in their turn the laborious game of recreating what is lost? Such an activity assumes a work of imagination to be like a mechanical product, which can be more or less easily integrated by him who has got hold of the right *clichés*. In the case of the M.E. version of the *Roman de la Rose*, Dr Brusendorff thinks his emendations 'practically certain or at least highly probable, since the changes made all bring the text closer to the French original.' What if even the original translator, as is often seen in passages undoubtedly genuine, was in fact less clever than Dr Brusendorff? Why should a perfect translation be likely to reproduce Chaucer's by the sole fact of its faithfulness? No one is more aware than Dr Brusendorff (p. 51) that the canon of Chaucer's usage is necessarily an abstract standard, based as it is on statistics and generalisations. It takes what is more frequent as the rule, and assumes Chaucer's style to be something fixed and immovable: what it really represents is not Chaucer's art, but his manner, his technique. It may be of some use in testing the attribution of a doubtful poem, but whoever tries to make not merely a negative use of it, but a positive one, is really writing anew a passage *à la manière de* Chaucer, under the pretence of emendation.

On account of irregularities and infractions of supposed Chaucerian usage recurring with different intensity in the extant M.E. version of the *Roman de la Rose*, this latter was broken up by Kaluza into three fragments, a division which was generally accepted until yesterday. Dr Brusendorff's explanation of the present state of the *Romaunt of the Rose* is entirely new and fascinating. It forms indeed the most valuable portion of his book, so that one feels justified in expounding it at some length.

After having found it hopeless to refer the particular French MS. used by the translator to any of the subgroups studied by Langlois, and having therefore concluded that the French original must have been a greatly contaminated MS., not unlike such a MS. as Brit. Mus. Eg. 881 (κω)¹, Dr Brusendorff proceeds to test Kaluza's theory. Kaluza split up into two the first of the two fragments established by Tyrwhitt, observing that there is an impure rhyme in ll. 1705 f., and that before this the French *bouton* is rendered by *knoppe*, but afterwards by *botoun*;

¹ The readings of the various French groups and subgroups are equally distributed throughout all parts of the English version, so that these cannot have been translated from different MSS.

moreover, about this juncture the translation is getting more diffuse. But Dr Brusendorff finds that the existence of a real break after l. 1705 is far from clear; in many other passages of the translation the sense is much more unsatisfactory as, for instance, in ll. 4217-20 which translate the French ll. 3879-82. Secondly, the French *moison* is rendered by *fasoun* in l. 551, but by *moysoun* in l. 1677, without the necessity of a new division becoming apparent. Finally, impure rhymes do not crop up in any large number till about l. 1800. From all this the definite fact emerges that there is no sharp break at l. 1705, but a gradual transition in ll. 1600-1800 from a comparatively close and correct translation to a rather looser and less correct one. Lines 1705-8 are simply corrupt. (Dr Brusendorff goes on to suggest a possible emendation, which, notwithstanding its faithfulness to the French original, is unwarranted by the M.E. text and may be taken as an illustration of criticisms made above.) On the other hand, the theory that the present text of the *Romaunt of the Rose* is a compound made up of scraps from two or three different translations is dismissed, for weighty reasons, in favour of a new hypothesis of later interference with the original translation. While apparent shortness is due to accidental omissions, the fragments preserved, while sometimes carefully translated, as in the beginning and towards the end, are often very loosely paraphrased, especially in the central part where circumlocutions abound. This is the result of a large number of insertions, varying in length from several lines, or even couplets, down to a single superfluous phrase, evidently inserted to eke out a line metrically. This method may in a few cases have been employed by ordinary scribes to replace lines omitted in the MSS. they copied; but on the whole they are far too numerous, about forty in all, to be completely accounted for in this way. Dr Brusendorff is thus brought to assert the existence of a peculiar source of grave textual corruption. The most remarkable feature of this corruption is given by the numerous cases of double translation: a careless and slovenly rendering of a French couplet generally precedes the real translation. Of course there is nothing inherently improbable in supposing the original translator to have sometimes inserted a couplet for the purpose of varying an idea; sometimes, however, the repetition is so absurdly superfluous as to stamp a couplet at once as a late addition. That the numerous cases of double translation are due to the activity of a reviser becomes still clearer from passages showing instances of anticipation rather than of repetition. On the other hand, there are several cases of corruption that cannot be explained by the hypothesis of a text made up from two different translations. A clue to a possible solution of the riddle of the phenomenon is found by Dr Brusendorff in transposition. Transposition may sometimes be occasioned by the translator's French MS. varying from the standard text, while in other cases it may have been effected by the original translator himself. But when the transposed lines exhibit faulty rhymes, the error may be ascribed to the reviser, especially where there is other evidence of

corruption in the adjoining couplets. But why should a reviser ever have taken the trouble to change the original order of the translation to insert completely inane couplets? The most remarkable case is doubtless offered by ll. 4953 f., inserted without anything to correspond to it in the French text, and translating French 4441 f. much better than the corresponding English couplet:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 4441 E suit les males compagnies E les desordenees vies | 4899 And makith hym loue yuell companye And lede his lyf disrewlily[e] 4953 And seuen yuell companye Riot and avoutrie |
|--|---|

It is very unlikely that the two renderings of one French couplet should have been taken from different English translations, for why, then, was the couplet 4953 f. inserted in a completely wrong setting? How did this and the other extraordinary shiftings noticed become possible? Dr Brusendorff's explanation, a very ingenious one, runs thus: Shortly after the completion of the M.E. version of the *Roman de la Rose* in the standard speech of the end of the fourteenth century, a person from some North Eastern Midland county put the work through a process of expansion. There is a pronounced difference between the two halves of fragment B in this respect, the first being far less heavily expanded than the last. In the middle part many lines are repeated again and again to no purpose, while some are not translated at all and others are torn away from their peculiar context and inserted elsewhere in the translation. Such a very unusual state of the text surely demands an equally unusual explanation. Mistakes which can only be explained as errors of the ear suggest as the only satisfactory explanation of the extreme corruption of the translation, heavily expanded and badly disarranged as it is, that its present text was not copied, directly or indirectly, from the author's MS., but was written down from memory¹ by a person from the North Midlands, who had once learned the translation by heart, and who still knew its first 1800 lines or so almost perfectly. During the next 4000 lines, however, his memory constantly failed him, so that at last he had to break off abruptly and start again at an episode which occurred nearly 6000 lines further on in the translation, but which he remembered better, until after some 1900 lines he had to break off finally, still almost 10,000 lines from the end. The additions and the general corruption of the text of course spoil the translation to some extent; still it remains a decidedly creditable, in parts even a brilliant, piece of work, well worthy of Chaucer as a whole.

Dr Brusendorff's theory seems to me open to serious objections. He maintains that the reviser knew and used the French original, as may be shown by a number of cases in which the French couplet is first

¹ Dr Brusendorff reports many cases to prove that mediæval scribes not unfrequently knew their texts by heart (p. 381). He thinks also that Shirley relied too much on his frequently failing memory (p. 233), for which he apparently apologises in a passage quoted in Appendix A, II, pp. 69 ff. But Shirley's words imply no more than the usual publishers' apologies for slips and imperfections of the ordinary character: no hint is given of this peculiar cause of corruption.

rendered by one with English rhyme-words and then by one which coolly transfers the French rhyme—as in 3575–8 (Langlois, 3311 f.):

Puis que Franchise s'i acorde
De pecheor misericorde

For Fraunchise wole and I, Pite,
That mercyful to hym ye be
And sith that she and I accorde
Have upon hym misericorde.

Here the last M.E. couplet seems to Dr Brusendorff quite superfluous. And superfluous it is, but not precisely a mere repetition, or double translation. If the reviser remembered more or less accurately the English couplet, as seems to be the case, why should he have taken the trouble to consult the French original, and retranslate the two lines? Dr Brusendorff's contention that the reviser reproduced the text as best he could, *sometimes* with the assistance of the French poem, introduces in 'sometimes' an element so elusive as to endanger the whole edifice. If the assumption of the presence of the French text is necessary in order to explain such cases as the one referred to, why did the reviser neglect to consult it when his memory failed him hopelessly, involving him in repetitions and transpositions? From a survey of Dr Brusendorff's quotations we should come to the strange conclusion that the reviser had recourse to the French text whenever he more or less remembered the English also, and did not feel the same need when his memory abandoned him altogether. This circumstance would be more than unusual, unique, not to say preposterous. Dr Brusendorff makes a point of the alleged predilection of the reviser for Romance terms. His use of pairs of synonyms, as the rest of M.E. literature shows, must probably be explained as an innocent contrivance, invented to draw attention to the writer's knowledge of the refined French language. An interesting case of doublets is offered by the twofold rendering of French *Bel Accueil* by *Bialacoil* and by *Fair-Welcomyng*. The first is an Anglo-French form, generally scanning as a trisyllabic word, but in some cases the metre requires the irregular pronunciation *Bi-al-a-coil*, which seems to suggest that this impossible form has simply replaced the regular quadrisyllabic translation *Fair-wel-com-yng*. This, according to Dr Brusendorff, is also indicated by a number of lines where an extra metrical syllable has been obtained by inserting a superfluous monosyllabic word before *Bialacoil*. The name *Bialacoil* occurs more than 20 times out of 33 under suspicious circumstances, a strong hint that this curious Anglo-French term is really due to later corruption of the text, and that the original rendering of French *Bel Accueil* was the true M.E. form *Fair-Welcomyng*. This further suggests that in the similar case of French *bouton(s)* being rendered by M.E. *knoppel(s)* and by *botoun(s)*, the former is the true translation and the latter a corruption. In the same way Dr Brusendorff thinks that other different translations of names are to be ascribed not to different authorship but to later interference.

Now the form *Fair-Welcomyng* occurs only in the last part of the extant translation (Fragment C), and there the supposed reviser apparently failed to discard it. Why? Because he then remembered the

text better? An altogether different hypothesis seems to possess at least an equal weight, i.e., that the original translator, in the course of his work, found at last a satisfactory English rendering of the term, and, while adopting it henceforward, omitted to substitute it for the French form in the central part. In accordance with this hypothesis one would explain the French couplets, taken by Dr Brusendorff for repetitions due to later addition, as first attempts at rendering the French original. Subsequently a more satisfactory English translation may have been thought of and written in the margin, but the copyist would include both renderings, considering the later versions, not as improvements, but as additions meant to be incorporated into the text. As a matter of fact, as Dr Brusendorff has noticed, generally a careless and slovenly rendering of a French couplet *precedes* the real translation instead of repeating it. Parallel cases in Chaucer's undoubted works are not wanting. In *Boethius* we find instances of glosses which are nothing else but alternative paraphrases, written in a better English form, of all that precedes (see Metre XI). In *Troilus*, v, st. 129, Chaucer first renders the Italian *ambagi* with *ambages*, then adds: 'That is to seyn, with double wordes slye.' Again Dr Brusendorff holds that the only satisfactory explanation of certain passages of *Troilus* is that the text goes back to Chaucer's own draft, where the passages were added in the margin or on loose slips: rejected and corrected readings got consequently mixed up. When correcting his draft—Dr Brusendorff remarks in a footnote at p. 103—Chaucer would presumably not have taken the trouble to 'rubbe and scrape'; he would probably merely pick out the rejected readings and add the final ones in the margin, as Shirley did in MS. Ashm. 59, f. 23 and elsewhere: such corrections might easily be misunderstood, and still more so when the line to be deleted was underlined as in the copy of Chaucer's so-called ABC. Thus, the insertion of M.E. 2831-4, partly identical with the rendering of French 2679 f. in M.E. 2843-6, might be due to a transposed copy of a new marginal draft of M.E. 2843-6. In the same way extraordinary shiftings of lines, difficult to be accounted for if we suppose with Dr Brusendorff that the reviser had before his eyes the French original to guide him, would find a more plausible explanation. If the hypothesis I am now merely suggesting could be admitted, the corrupt part of the *Romaunt of the Rose* would be traced back to a bad copy of the original translator's first draft, made confusing by alternative readings. For fragments A and C better MSS. would have been available. I would not offer this theory for much more than a tentative conjecture, but neither does Dr Brusendorff's explanation seem to me likely to settle the question for ever, notwithstanding the amazing ingenuity he displays. The inconsistencies his explanation involves still wait to be cleared up.

Though it forms the most conspicuous part of the book, the chapter on the *Romaunt of the Rose* is far from representing Dr Brusendorff's whole work. His opinions on Chaucer's relations to Italian authors are of particular interest. I entirely agree with him when he says that

Dante's influence on the *House of Fame* was greatly exaggerated by Rambeau (p. 149), and that in Lydgate's *Dante in ynglyssh* we are rather to see another allusion to the *Canterbury Tales* (very likely Lydgate took D 1131-76 to have been translated from Dante, as in a way it was). Indisputable as is the connexion between the *House of Fame* and Dante in many details, the dependence of the English poem on Froissart's *Temple d'Onnour* is still greater (pp. 158 ff.). Dr Brusendorff seems inclined to accept Chaucer's usually doubted knowledge of Petrarca's *Trionfo della Fama*, and believes that he finds special evidence of it in the alleged dependence of *Clerk's Tale*, E 995 ff. on *Trionfo del Tempo*, 127-35 (which, by the way, he quotes with two errors, a comma instead of a full stop being needed after *crede*; and *pur* instead of *par* in the third line). I cannot see the inevitability of this latter parallel, the whole passage reading as one of the commonplaces in mediæval poetry. Neither do I find in Petrarca's sonnet 'Ite o caldi sospiri al freddo core' the close verbal parallel to Chaucer's *Complaint of Pity*, l. 14, which strikes Dr Brusendorff so much: one may even suspect Dr Brusendorff not to be fully aware of the exact meaning of Italian *contende*. But even a close parallel would mean very little in the case of a hackneyed image. The Latin titles of the single legends of *Good Women* seem to Dr Brusendorff to have been developed from Boccaccio's chapter-headings in *De Claris Mulieribus*. The dependence is in any case a very slight one, since by far the most characteristic element in Chaucer's titles is the designation 'Martyr' (the authentic title of the *Legend* is admittedly *The Legend of Cupid's Saints*), and this detail seems rather to point to a French model (see also Skeat, III, 303, under note to l. 338). But Dr Brusendorff is right in finding *Filostrato*, VII, st. 99, to be the source of ll. 5-7 of *Moral Balade (of Gentilesse)* (p. 256).

In discussing Chaucer's portraits Dr Brusendorff observes how often Chaucer himself refers to the custom of reading his poems aloud to a select audience. Passages in *Troilus* seem to be quite explicit in this sense, still Bk v, l. 270 (without anything corresponding to it in *Filostrato*) has: 'Thou, *redere*, mayst thy-self ful wel devyne.'

I feel unable here to do justice to all the valuable remarks scattered in Dr Brusendorff's book. On all difficult problems he sheds the light of his critical acumen, and even if one differs at times from his conclusions, there is no doubt that he has revealed many new facts which all students of Chaucer in the future must take into account.

MARIO PRAZ.

LIVERPOOL.

Early Tudor Drama: Medwall, The Rastells, Heywood, and the More Circle. By A. W. REED. London: Methuen. 1926. xv + 246 pp. 10s. 6d.

The predominant theological interest of the first half of the sixteenth century has often absorbed its historians, to the neglect of its secular aspects. Men were making literature then, and engaging in all sorts of

delightful human activities. But their personalities are far less familiar to us than those of their Elizabethan successors. Dr Reed's studies, the scope of which is wider than his short title, will contribute to the removal of this reproach. He has brought together a number of papers, most of which originally appeared in *Transactions* of the Bibliographical Society and the Shakespeare Association. This origin is responsible for a certain amount of repetition, and an occasional need for the reader to piece out the full narrative of a single career from more than one chapter. But on the whole I think that it was right not to attempt a more fundamental recast; not so much because the present form 'reflects the actual process of searching of which the book is a record,' since there is no particular reason why a treatise should be an autobiography; but because it is obviously desirable that Dr Reed should proceed to further searching with as little delay as possible. For this he is eminently qualified by his acuteness in following up historical and bibliographical clues, and by the industry which has already brought together so much valuable matter from State Papers and Chamber Accounts, from Subsidy Rolls and Parish Registers, from the Probate Office and the Vicar-General's Books, from the proceedings of Chancery and the Court of Requests. In particular, I hope that he will take a hint of his own, and give us an edition of some at least of the English works of Sir Thomas More. The mighty spirit of Sir Thomas broods over the present book, although no chapter of it is directly devoted to him. The main figures are his brother-in-law John Rastell, his nephew, John's son William, and John Heywood, who was William's brother-in-law. Dr Reed gives an excellent account of John Rastell, a characteristic product of the many-sided Renaissance, by turns lawyer, printer, military engineer, explorer, astronomer, theologian, politician, deviser and setter-forth of pageants and plays. His multifarious enthusiasms suggest some instability of temperament, and his latter days were unfortunate. He had diverged from the ecclesiastical standpoint of More, and had become an agent of Cromwell. But his attitude on the vexed question of tithes seems to have brought him into conflict with Cranmer, and he died in prison. He is of importance in the story of the drama, some of the traditions of which he may have brought with him to London from his native Coventry. He built a stage, the locality of which Dr Reed makes precise for us, in Finsbury, herein anticipating by half a century the adventure of James Burbage. Dr Reed establishes a strong case for his authorship, in addition to *The Four Elements*, of the play or *débat* of *Gentleness and Nobility*. His son William succeeded him as a printer, and produced several of Heywood's plays, as well as many of the works of More. John Heywood is a better known man, and I am not sure that Dr Reed has not a little obscured our record of him. A John Heywood appears as a singer at Court in 1519, and a John Heywood is also traceable as a Yeoman of the Royal Chamber in 1514 and 1520. Dr Reed, who desires, perhaps sentimentally, to regard the singer as introduced to the royal service by More, who also came to Court in 1519, declines to identify

the two. He may be right, since Heywood seems to be a common name in the household books. But certainly his argument that the Yeoman was another John Heywood who received a pension on retirement in 1525 is a bad one, for this other John Heywood was a *Garcio* or Groom of the Household, and a *Garcio* was an officer of lower grade than a *Valettus* or Yeoman. Similarly, I do not think that Dr Reed can be right in thinking that, because the dramatist received a 'pencion' in 1528, he in his turn retired, although only for a time, in that year. A 'pencion' is not necessarily a retiring allowance, and the amount granted was paid to Heywood as a player of the Virginals and appears under the head of 'Quarterly Wages' in the Chamber Accounts. Dr Reed has a long and interesting discussion of Heywood's interludes. He confirms from internal evidence his authorship of the *Four PP.*, to which indeed Middleton's title-page is almost sufficient testimony. And he thinks that with the *Four PP.* must go the similar *Pardoner and Frere* and *Johan Johan*, although he was evidently at one time under a temptation to ascribe these to More. The book is completed by papers on *The Regulation of the Book Trade before the Proclamation of 1538*, and on *The Merry Jest of the Widow Edyth*. The former elucidates the attempt to exercise a censorship through the ecclesiastical machinery with the help of a system of 'privileges,' which preceded the more effective control of the Privy Council and the Stationers' Company. The latter is an amusing account of a *jeu d'esprit* of one Walter Smyth, a personal servant of More and afterwards sword-bearer to the Lord Mayor. It is written around the impostures of a clever adventuress who tricked many of More's friends, and Dr Reed has been successful in tracing most of the personages concerned. I do not know whether Thomas Arthur, the 'man' of Master Roper, whom he leaves untraced, can be the Thomas Artour of Cambridge, to whom Bale ascribes *tragoediae* of *Microcosmus* and *Mundus Plumbeus*.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

OXFORD.

Fulgens and Lucre: A Fifteenth-Century Secular Play. By Henry Medwall. Edited by F. S. Boas and A. W. REED. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1926. xxviii + 104 pp. 7s. 6d.

This is the second play of Medwall's to be made public in recent times. *Nature* was reprinted from a unique copy by Professor Brandl in his *Quellen* in 1898. The unique copy of *Fulgens and Lucre* came to light in 1919 at the Mostyn sale. Purchased by Mr H. E. Huntington, it was promptly issued, by permission of the generous owner, in photographic facsimile. The present editors have carefully reproduced this text, with the minimum of corrections, punctuation, etc., needed to make it readable.

It is (as the preface informs us) 'the earliest known English secular play,' and altogether a more interesting document than its predecessor. *Nature* has all the tediousness of a morality play, relieved only by

patches of rather coarse humour. In *Fulgens and Lucre* we have passed from the Middle Age to the Renaissance, and are looking forward to Elizabethan comedy. The main theme, the wooing of Lucre, daughter of the Roman senator Fulgens, by Publius Cornelius, the loose-living aristocrat, and Gaius Flaminius, the virtuous plebeian, and her choice of the latter (with a truly feminine disregard of judicial evidence), is based on Tiptoft's version of a *controversia*, entitled '*de vera nobilitate*,' by the Florentine Bonaccorso of Pistoja, an early Ciceronian and follower of Petrarch. It is expounded in some long and quaint but sufficiently eloquent speeches, in rhyme-royal. To this is added a comic under-plot, sustained by two youths, baldly named A. and B., and Jone, the handmaid of Lucre. A. and B. take service with the two suitors. Their attitude to their respective masters (and to the audience), their wooing of Jone, with some very low humour and rough horseplay in which Jone takes an active part, are a notable foretaste of later comedy.

The play, like *Nature*, is in two parts¹. The action of Part I is recapitulated briefly at the beginning of Part II, perhaps for the benefit of the spectator who had not witnessed the first half.

The editorial work (it hardly needs saying) is scholarly and helpful throughout. The introduction, of some twenty pages, gives all necessary information about the author and the source of his main plot, together with an adequate criticism of the style and a careful 'placing' of the piece as a dramatic landmark².

The notes deal mainly with language and vocabulary. A few northernisms mentioned here (and referred to in the introduction, p. xxvi) belong, I think, to some literary fashion or convention of the time. At any rate, the general style of the play, its diction and its jests, strike me as being pure Londonese. Of the few northernisms alleged by the editors, one at least, *that* for *those*, is not unknown in the south at this date. And it is rather misleading to cite Bp Douglas for *laysyr* (= leisure), a pure southern form.

I add a few comments in detail, by way of correction or suggestion.

1, 238: 'wordly' is so common a spelling of 'worldly' that it might have been kept in the text, even though we find 'worldly' in 167 *ante*. I suspect that Medwall would use either form indifferently.

1, 601-2. The editors have duly corrected 'substanuce' to 'substance,' but have printed 'dyssemblanuce' where the original has blamelessly 'dyssemblanuce'!

1, 617:

And of one thyng I wyll a certayne.

I doubt if we have here the phrase 'a certayne,' as the note suggests. Is it not rather the verb 'acertayne' = assure (with 'you' possibly dropped out)? In either case a stop seems needed at the end of this line.

1, 727: 'Nay by yes.'—Professor Craigie's suggestion that 'yes' is a

¹ As the lines are numbered separately for each part, it might have been well to indicate the 'part' at the top or bottom of the page, both in text and notes.

² The argument in section vii for dating the play 1497 does not seem very solidly based.

misprint for 'ges' (= Jesus) receives support from a converse error in *Nature*, I, 532: 'yet, yt appereth not so to euery mannys ges,' where Professor Manly has plausibly suggested, for the last word, 'yes' (= eyes).

I, 846, 1084: 'hens to yorke,' 'hens to cales.' A note on this idiom, which has caused editors of *Roister Doister* to stumble curiously, might have been more apposite than the comments actually made in each place.

I, 854-5:

I shall come within two stonys caste:
Of her I aske no more.

This should perhaps be punctuated:

within two stonys caste
Of her, I aske no more.

I, 903:

By god gyue it a very vengeaunce!

The construction halts, since 'god' must be the subject of 'gyue.' The editors have misread the facsimile, which has, not 'By,' but 'Ey' (= Ay!), as in line 1028, 'Ey godes mercy.' The facsimile also has 'a very very vengeaunce,' which is perhaps needlessly altered: the repetition of 'very' is idiomatic enough, and the metre is not hurt by it.

I, 974-6:

And for my mariage, that is a thing
In the whyche I purpose to geue a sparyng
For a yere or two.

A note seems wanted on 'geue a sparyng,' which means 'make a delay or postponement.' Cf. *Nature*, II, 234:

Thys answeere will I deffar and spare.

I, 1011-13:

This gentylman can wytnes bere
That all this owre I haue stonde here
Sechyng euen for you.

The jest, such as it is, is like that in *Nature*, II, 165:

Mary syr I haue sytten and sought you
Thys thre or .iiii. howrys.

I, 1183:

Tushe that is the lest care of .xv.

'This sounds like a proverbial phrase, but is apparently not otherwise known,' say the editors. Professor Moore Smith has a note in this *Review*, vol. II, 348, where he quotes from *Hyckescorner* (line 130, ed. Manly) an exact parallel:

Nay, that is the leest thought that they have of fyftene.

II, 283. The word 'noke' is incorrectly explained to be a variant of 'nook' = corner. It is evidently an early instance of *Nock sb.*¹ sense 2 in the *New English Dictionary*.

II, 383:

Syr, I shall gyue you the lokynge on.

An idiomatic expression, meaning 'I shall be pleased to witness your show,' and deserving a note.

II, 389:

Spele vp tamboryne, etc.

The editors think this line is accounted for by the presence of Flemish guests at the performance. However this may be, it is a precursor of a good many speeches in 'Flemish' in Elizabethan comedy.

II, 397:

He wyll deserue it, I vndertake,
On the largest wyse.

'Deserue' here means 'requite, reward.'

II, 490:

And so were myne auctours reputed alway.

Should not this be corrected to 'auncetours,' as in lines 463, 465, 499?

II, 533. The editors correct 'vnderstonde' to 'vnderstoode.' Rather, perhaps, 'vnderstode.' (The word rhymes with 'gode,' 'blode'.)

II, 535:

thy self [the plebeian Gaius] whiche now of late
Among noble gentylmen playest checkmate.

The explanation 'defeat, bring to ruin' does not fit the context. 'To play checkmate (among)' must here mean 'to behave oneself, put oneself forward, as an equal.'

II, 656:

And where he to wyteth me of pore kyn.

The note runs: '*wyteth me of*, reproaches me with,' without mention of 'to,' which the editors perhaps take to mean 'too,' 'also.' The same expression occurs in line 693:

And where he to witeth me....

It has been suggested to me that *twite* [M.E. *atwiten*, Mod. E. *twit*] may have become with some speakers *to-wite* on the analogy of *to-breke*, etc. I offer no opinion.

II, 691-2:

the nobles [= nobility] of thyn auncetours euerycheon
Shall vtterly starue and die in the alone.

The Quarto has 'starce,' which suggests, as an easier correction, 'scarce,' a rare verb meaning 'become scant,' 'diminish.' It may be noted that 'scaecenes' (= scarceness, want) occurs two lines later.

II, 829:

I wolde let her go in the mare name.

Explained, plausibly, to mean 'in the devil's name.' It might have been added that the phrase recurs in *Nature*, II, 944.

The Clarendon Press has played up to the learned editors by the accurate printing and elegant turn-out of this little volume, which is a most welcome addition to the 'Tudor and Stuart Library.'

WALTER WORRALL.

OXFORD.

A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres. From the Original Edition. London: Frederick Etchells and Hugh Macdonald. 1926. xxxix + 198 pp. 21s.

The present reprint from the Haslewood Press, of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, sounds a warning and a challenge to students of early Elizabethan literature. George Gascoigne, the pioneer soldier-poet, and author of the original volume, has remained too long in the shadows of obscurity and neglect. His biographers and investigators have taken earlier investigations for granted, without deeper research. They have contented themselves with secondary sources for authority, and have largely ignored documentary material.

Mr B. M. Ward, who signs the introduction to the present volume, and is responsible for its arrangement, has defied earlier critics. He adds new facts to the life of Gascoigne and proclaims new theories regarding the poet's early work, which are at least provocative of comment.

In the first paragraph of the introduction he offers his opening volley with the announcement that the volume, *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, was first published in the summer of 1573. One suspects that this date was not confirmed by actual investigation. There is no date and no author's name on the title page of the original volume. A list of printed books, under the names of the various publishers of the period (Volume v of the *Transcript of the Stationers' Register*, pp. 84 and 86), contains, however, two entries of its publication. The first, in the list of Henry Binneman's¹ publications, occurs within the limiting dates of 17 November and 31 December, 15 Elizabeth (1572), while the second entry is in the list of Richard Smith's publications, within the period between 17 November and 31 December, 16 Elizabeth (1573), and both publications are assigned to George Gascoigne.

The appearance of two entries of what has been known as the first edition of Gascoigne's collected poems would suggest the erroneous duplication of a single publication by the compiler of the lists, if the examination of all the known copies of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* did not warrant two entries. Mr Ward traces only four copies of the volume (Introd., p. viii), three in the British Museum and one in the Bodleian Library. There are two other copies in existence, however, one in the University Library, and one in Emmanuel College Library, Cambridge. The contents of all six of these copies are identical up to a certain point. All have a break of pagination on page 164, at the end of 'Jocasta,' where Binneman's colophon is affixed; all begin again with fresh signatures on page 201, with 'A discourse of the adventures passed by Master F. I.,' and end 'Dan Bartholmew of Bathe,' on page 445, with the colophon of Richard Smith. Here, four of the six known copies end. Two copies, one in the British Museum, and the Bodleian copy, contain in addition, in bolder type, a pamphlet consisting of 'The Steele Glas' and 'The Complaint of Philomene,' which was not issued separately until 1576. It is well known that Gascoigne wrote many of his pieces

¹ Binneman at this period was a printer as well as publisher.

long before they were given to the public. It is conceivable that the pamphlet of *The Steele Glas* and *Complaint* was ready for publication in 1573. The addition of such a pamphlet to a portion of the first edition may account for two issues of the volume, a year apart, according to the entries in the *Transcript of the Stationers' Register*. Gascoigne was in Holland in the service of the Prince of Orange when the book first appeared. It was extremely unpopular because of the alleged scandalous tale of 'The Adventures of Master F. I.,' which was construed as a reflection on the characters of certain persons of high calling. Gascoigne undoubtedly was informed of the situation, and to cover over the glaring faults of the first issue it is probable that he ordered his publishers to append the pamphlet containing the two new pieces to the volume, which was reissued before his return to England. Thus the two entries of the book in the *Transcript of the Stationers' Register* are accounted for.

Mr Ward interprets the interruption in pagination, which occurs in all of the known copies of the original volume, as the binding together of two distinct books, the latter of which he reprints as the original *Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* proper. The break in pagination is more easily explained, however, in view of the different colophons affixed to the different portions, which were printed separately by Henry Binneman and by Richard Smith. Binneman apparently had in hand the printing of the first half of the volume, consisting of the two plays, *The Supposes*, and *Jocasta*, while to Smith was allotted the rest of the book. The reason for the collaboration of two publishers in the production of one book was probably the desire of the author to hasten its appearance in order to gain an enviable reputation while he was absent in the wars. The 'Table of Contents' in the six known copies of the volume confirms this theory, for it lists *The Supposes* and *Jocasta*, contained in the first half of the volume, as well as the pieces of the latter half of the volume which are included in Mr Ward's reprint. The prefatory letter of 'The Printer to the Reader,' occurring in all six copies of the book, also adds strength to the theory, for in it are mentioned by name both the 'comedy of *The Supposes*' and 'the tragedy of *Jocasta*,' which are commended to the reader's judgment together with the pieces of the second half of the volume.

The fact that Gascoigne, on his return to England in 1574/5, 'corrected, perfected and augmented,' *The Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, and issued his second edition, *The Posies*, 'from my poore house at Walthamstowe in the Forest the second of Januarie, 1575,' testifies to the failure of the second issue of the first edition in so far as it may have been an effort to counteract the unpopularity of the first issue.

Regardless of whether there were one or two issues of the first edition of *The Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*—a problem which is difficult to solve with the present available information—the fact remains that the arbitrary selection for publication in the reprint, of only the second half of the volume, which does not exist in any known copy unaccompanied by the first half, tends to lessen the well-known, high standard set by

the publishers in their previous work. In the same connexion another omission may be mentioned. 'A Discourse of the adventures of Master F. I.,' in the original *Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, consists, as Mr Ward states (Introd., p. viii), of a long prose tale interspersed with 13 lyric poems. The reprint contains only the poems with short prose explanations. The fact that the prose portion in the original was 93 pages in length aroused, apparently, no question in Mr Ward's mind regarding the motive for the piece; and yet a careful examination of the prose matter reveals at least one interesting fact, i.e., that each of the original hundred 'sundrie flowres,' comprising Gascoigne's first collected edition—which, indeed, was not misnamed *The HUNDRETH Sundrie Flowres*—is mentioned by title or theme in this tale. But without the careful examination which alone will reveal this fact, it is unconventional, nevertheless, to omit any portion of the original version in a reprint claiming to be such.

Again, in the first paragraph of Mr Ward's introduction, occurs the broadside of his attack on the early critics. Although admitting that the volume is 'usually considered to be the work of one man only—George Gascoigne—' Mr Ward claims that it is really an anthology, 'the first, in fact, of the many anthologies published in Queen Elizabeth's reign' (Introd., p. vii). A large portion of the introduction is devoted to the proof of this theory, and the various series of poems, identified by the 'posy' or device attached to them, are assigned to various writers and courtiers of the period. For instance, the 'posy,' *si fortunatus infelix*, attached to the first seventeen of 'The devises of sundrie gentlemen'—one of the portions of *The Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*—and to the sonnet preceding the tragedy of *Jocasta*, is ascribed by Mr Ward to Sir Christopher Hatton, who is proclaimed author of the poems. The proof of this claim consists largely of an annotation made by Gabriel Harvey in his copy of Gascoigne's *Posies*, concerning this particular motto, which he states was 'lately the posy of Sir Christopher Hatton.' The danger of identifying writers by their 'posy,' or device, is apparent, however, when one recalls that these were frequently borrowed or adopted after the death of the original holder. It is likely that Sir Christopher Hatton thus adopted the 'fortunatus infelix' motto, after Gascoigne's death in 1578, just as Sir Walter Raleigh similarly borrowed Gascoigne's favourite motto: 'Tam Marti quam Mercurio.'

In like manner Mr Ward identifies the 'meritum petere, grave' motto with Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, who thus is given the honour of having written another series of these poems. In proof of this point Mr Ward analyses an acrostic poem, entitled, 'The absent lover (in ciphers) deciphering his name, doth crave some speedy relief . . .,' and finds hidden in the poem the name of Edward de Vere. This method of identifying an author is weakened, however, when one finds in the same poem—using the same 'key' suggested by Mr Ward (Introd., p. xxviii)—the names of George Gascoigne, Elizabeth Gascoigne, Thomas Churchyard, and even the present writer's own name. Obviously this

method fails to unfold the secret, although it may provide amusement for a winter's afternoon.

A cursory glance through Gascoigne's collected poems reveals the fact that it was the poet's custom to end his verses with a Latin or English motto or device, instead of signing his initials or name. In his dedicatory letter 'To the Readers generally,' prefixed to his 'corrected, perfected and augmented' *Posies*, in 1575, he explains this usage, as follows:

If ever I wrote lyne for myselfe in causes of love, I have written tenne for other men in layes of lust. . . . And by that it proceedeth, that I have so often chaunged my Posie or worde. For when I did compile any thing at the request of other men, if I had subscribed the same with mine owne usuall *mot* or devise, it might have bewrayed the same to have bene of my doing. And I was ever. . . lothe to bewray the follies of other men. And yet. . . I am not verie daungerous to lay my selfe wide open in view of the worlde. I have also sundrie tymes chaunged mine owne worde or devise. And no mervaille: For he that wandereth much in those wildernesses, shall seldome continue long in one minde.

Thus Gascoigne himself denies Mr Ward's theory that several authors were responsible for the several devices.

An examination of the editorial matter connecting the various poems in 'The devises of sundrie gentlemen' throws further light on Gascoigne's sole authorship of all the pieces. For example, the 'si fortunatus infelix' device, which Mr Ward attributes to Sir Christopher Hatton, is affixed to a poem entitled 'His Riddle,' to which the following explanatory comment is prefixed by the editor and shows indisputably that 'G. G.' (George Gascoigne) was the author of that group of poems:

. . . you shall now understand, that soone after this answer of hirs, the same Author chaunced to be at a supper in hir company, where were also hir brother, hir husband, and an old lover of hirs by whom she had bin long suspected. Nowe, although these wanted no delicate viands to content them, yit their chief repast was by entreglancing of lookes. For G. G. being stoong with hot affection, could none otherwise relieve his passion but by gazing. And the Dame of a curteous enclination deigned (now and then) to requite the same with glancing at him. . . . This royall banquet thus passed over, G. G. knowing that after supper they should passe the tyme in propounding of Riddles, and making of purposes: contrived all this conceipt in a Riddle as followeth, etc.

The poems signed with the motto, 'meritum petere, grave,' occurring in the original volume last before those poems which are admittedly by Gascoigne, and which Mr Ward ascribes to Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, end with 'The absent lover (in ciphers). . .,' and this is followed by the ensuing editorial comment, which alone indicates that the preceding verses were written by Gascoigne:

I will now deliver unto you so many more of Master Gascoignes Poems as have come to my hands, who hath never been dayntie of his doings, and therfore I conceale not his name: but his word or posie he hath often changed and therfore I will deliver his verses with such sundrie posies as I received them. . . .

The phrase, 'so many more of Master Gascoignes Poems,' implies that the previous ones were written by the same hand, and this is further borne out by the subsequent words that 'his word or posie he hath often

changed.' Gascoigne himself has admitted the same thing in his 'corrected, perfected and augmented' edition, as is noted above.

Another new theory is presented by Mr Ward in the introduction to his reprint (pp. xviii, xix, xxxv). This concerns Queen Elizabeth's recognition of Gascoigne as poet laureate to her court. The evidence cited by Mr Ward seems to consist only of a drawing by the poet, in which he is represented kneeling before Her Majesty with a sword girt to his side, a spear in his left hand, and in his right hand a book which he offers to her. An arm is suspended from the ceiling holding his favourite motto, and over his head is a laurel wreath. This drawing was used as a frontispiece to 'The Tale of Hemetes the Hermit,' which the poet presented to Her Highness as a New Year's gift, in remembrance of her visit to Woodstock during the late summer of 1576, when she expressed her deep appreciation of the entertainment afforded by her host. It is not sufficient proof, however, that the poet was actually named laureate, but probably expresses his great ambition. Indeed, evidence of this ambition is available on every hand. He longed for the laureateship, laboured for it on every occasion, even begged abjectly to be placed 'high in a Prince's stable.' But that his hopes were never realised is apparent from the lack of official testimony to the contrary, as well as from passages in his own works.

A New Year's letter to Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, so late as 1 January 1577 (historical year), told of the poet having been 'latelye receavede into Her Majestie's service,' but that this was not in the capacity of laureate is apparent at the end of the letter, where is described his anticipated 'longe jorneye,' for which he will be unprovided unless the Lord Keeper, his wife's kinsman, and other friends will agree to contribute to his support.

The so-called 'recognition theory' is further shattered in the poet's dedicatory letter to Queen Elizabeth, of his 'Grief of Jove,' presented to her on the same New Year's day:

If your Ma(ies)tie shall lyke the worke, and deeme yt worthy of publication, I will then shrink for no paynes untill I haue... touched all the common places of mans perylous pleasures. ... But without the confirmation of your favorable acceptauns... I will never presume to publishe anything hereafter....

The fact that this is the last known work of the poet strengthens the belief that he never received 'the confirmation of (Her) favorable acceptauns.' If he had received the Queen's mark of esteem, if he had been made laureate to her court, his works would not have ended there, nor is it likely that they would have been so long neglected.

Mr Ward's enquiries, although not of an exhaustive nature, yield interesting facts concerning the poet, whose life heretofore has been shrouded in obscurity. Many of the documents now available in the archives of the Public Records Office are not mentioned, however, in the introduction to the reprint, and error is not entirely lacking. For instance, Mr Ward believes in the existence of a second George Gascoigne, with whom the poet frequently has been confused. He does not state,

however, that this other Gascoigne was a member of the Middle Temple and a resident of Northamptonshire and Gloucester, and that his death occurred shortly before 7 November 1620, thus differentiating the lives of the two men. He also confuses the two in his statement that it was the other George who was an M.P. in 1558, when, as a matter of fact, according to the lists of *Members of Parliament* (Pt I, vol. LXII), the poet George was returned to parliament 2 January 1557/8, for the borough of Bedford, at the early age of 16 years. Mr Ward's information concerning the marriage of Gascoigne to Elizabeth Breton, née Bacon, is insufficient. This matter is discussed in my article on George Gascoigne, in the April 1926 issue of the *Review of English Studies*, and need not be repeated here. Mr Ward mentions in his introduction (p. xvi) one John Bacon, the father of Elizabeth, who, he claims, died on 7 April 1559, and in whose will a daughter, Boyes, and son-in-law, Boyes, are named. On the evidence of this will, Mr Ward deduces the theory that Elizabeth Breton who married George Gascoigne was first the wife of Boyes, although no Christian names for the daughter and son-in-law are given. A search through the wills of the period discloses the existence of five John Bacon's, all of the county of Suffolk, one of whom may have been the father of Elizabeth Breton. According to the Chetham Society Publications, however (vol. LXXI, p. 2), Elizabeth was the daughter of a John Bacon of London, and no will for this man has been discovered.

From the evidence available at present it is impossible to determine whether Edward Boyes and Elizabeth were ever married. From the evidence afforded in two pieces, 'Eyther a needelesse or a bootelesse comparison betwene two letters,' being a comparison of the letters B and G, the latter of which is recommended to the person addressed, to be taken 'dooble...for thy most loving letter'; and the prefatory material to 'His Riddle,' part of which is quoted above, one might infer that Boyes was perhaps a favourite admirer of Elizabeth before her marriage to Gascoigne. The matter of the fray in Redcross Street, quoted by Mr Ward (Introd., p. xvi) from Henry Machyn's *Diary*, suggests the marital relation between Boyes and Elizabeth, but this is unsupported by official evidence. Certain suits brought in the Queen's court, by Gascoigne and his wife, against Boyes, imply that the latter had unlawfully gained possession of certain bequests left by William Breton to his children, and of other papers, by means of which he annoyed Elizabeth, and perhaps tried to claim her as his lawful wife. That he did not succeed, if this was his intention, is apparent, for the controversy ended to Gascoigne's satisfaction, and in full proof of his legal marriage to Elizabeth, when the Queen on 17 February 1568/9 granted to her beloved George Gascoigne the custody of Richard Breton (cf. *Patent Roll*, 11 Elizabeth, Pt 8, Mem. 10). And on 1 June of the same year, she also restored to Gascoigne full entry into his rightful inheritance which his father, Sir John, had disposed of, in other ways, before his death (cf. *Patent Roll*, 11 Eliz. Pt 4, Mem. 26).

On the textual accuracy of the reprint, so far as it goes, and the care exercised in the reproduction of the engravings and illustrations, Mr Ward and the Haslewood Press may be heartily congratulated.

GENEVIEVE AMBROSE.

OXFORD.

The Works of Shakespeare. The Merchant of Venice. Edited by Sir A. QUILLER-ROUCH and J. D. WILSON. Cambridge: University Press. 1926. xxxiii + 193 pp. 6s.

Professor Wilson's reconstruction of the textual history of *The Merchant of Venice* follows lines which are by now familiar. It involves (a) the prompt-book of *The Jew* played at the Bull about 1579; (b) several probable intermediate handlings by various dramatists; (c) a revision of this old play by Shakespeare early in 1594; (d) the addition of a passage after the execution of Lopez in June 1594; (e) a further revision by Shakespeare at a date as to which 'we have no suggestions to make'; (f) the loss (I presume) of the prompt-book; (g) the transcription by one scribe of the dialogue from players' 'parts,' with abbreviated speech-prefixes, to form a new prompt-copy; (h) the addition of stage-directions by another scribe; (i) the insertion of theatrical interpolations. Here are many coat-tails spread, and I propose to step upon most of them. It seems likely, from Stephen Gosson's brief description, which is all we have, that *The Jew* already contained the double theme of *The Merchant*; and if so, it, or some source of it, or some derivative from it, may have given Shakespeare his plot. But, while Professor Wilson's 'intermediate' dramatists are of course a wanton flourish, he does not go far towards establishing a textual continuity between plays of different companies, fifteen or twenty years asunder, by pointing to a Shakespearian inconsistency as to the number of Portia's wooers, to another as to the precise political effect which a refusal of justice to Shylock would have upon the state of Venice, and to the presence in the play of a scrap of doggerel and some speeches of inferior workmanship. For Shakespeare's own double recension, Professor Wilson relies mainly upon two arguments. Firstly, he thinks that the cause of Antonio's melancholy has been relegated to obscurity by an alteration. I cannot attach much importance to this. Professor Wilson's own explanation, with which I agree, is that Antonio was anticipating the loss of his friend Bassanio in marriage. Such a sentiment might very well have a personal interest for the writer of the *Sonnets*, but it is only a subordinate motive in the play, and it was not particularly necessary that it should be underlined for the audience. Secondly, he thinks that the elaborate preparation for a mask at Bassanio's house must originally have led up to a scene in which that mask took place. Certainly such a scene, with Shylock as a guest confronted by his daughter in the lovely garnish of a boy, would have had its humorous possibilities. But after all Jessica's travesty was primarily for the convenience of an elopement, and it was for this and not for masking that she took the casket with her. I think it must be recognised

as a feature of Shakespeare's dramatic art that he frequently introduces references both to personages and to events that he does not stage. They give a sense of solidity, as of time passing behind the action. In a modern jargon, they are 'fourth-dimensional.' Professor Wilson makes subsidiary play with short lines in the scenes concerned which he regards as 'broken' and as evidence of 'cuts.' There are about fifty short lines in the play, and I doubt whether any of them are properly described as broken. The great majority are short phrases of salutation, farewell or dismissal, or are interruptions, or introduce quoted matter. There is an example of Abbott's double section. A few are speech endings, for which such cadences become more and more common in Shakespeare's verse. There are about half a dozen others in mid-speech, which cause no rhythmic jar if they are treated as dramatic pauses, for changes of address, or for the hesitations of Antonio's preoccupation or Portia's maidenly modesty, or the like. The most abrupt is Lorenzo's:

So are you, sweet,
Even in the lovely garnish of a boy.
But come at once;
For the close night doth play the runaway,
And we are stay'd for at Bassanio's feast.

But there is no obvious lacuna in the sense. As to the date, there is not much to go upon. I think that 1596 fits the metrical evidence rather better than 1594, and that there is some tendency among critics to crowd too much into 1594 and 1595. The plague only left half of 1594 available for playing. No doubt there is some reminiscence of the Lopez affair, but the analogy with that of Shylock is not very close, and it is not imperative to suppose that the trial was recent. Nor is proximity to the coronation of Henry IV of France on 27 February 1594 really necessary to explain:

the flourish when true subjects bow
To a new-crownéd monarch.

And now as to what happened to the play when Shakespeare had done with it. There is, of course, nothing to explain why the prompt-book of so recent a play should have required reconstruction from 'parts.' Perhaps Professor Wilson thinks that the original was lost in the fitting from the Theatre to the Globe. He does not say. The evidence for reconstruction which he offers is purely internal; carelessness in the insertion of letters and casket-scrolls into the dialogue, the paucity and vagueness of the stage-directions, confusions in the speech-prefixes. It is very likely the case that documents to be read by actors on the stage were separately copied out by the book-holder, and did not appear in the parts. And if so, the incorporation of them in the text of a reconstructing scribe might explain the failure of the Quarto to indicate clearly the personages to whom they were assigned. At the same time, I do not see any convincing reason why the carelessness should not be Shakespeare's. As to the stage-directions, there are not many, but there are enough, except for the omission of a few obvious exits and one entry, for stage purposes. A prompt-copy did not need so much picturesque

glossing as Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and Professor Wilson think wholesome for a modern reader. There are vaguenesses. Leonardo comes in as 'a follower,' Salerio as one of the 'magnificoes,' Nerissa as part of a 'trainee,' Balthasar as 'a man of Portia's,' Stephano as 'a messenger.' These look to me like Shakespeare's stage-directions, and so do such phrases as 'with a follower or two' and 'three or four followers accordingly.' An actor-playwright, writing for his own company, may very well leave the number of supernumeraries to the stage-manager, knowing that anyhow he will settle it in the end. Professor Wilson's second scribe seems to me quite superfluous here. So too with the speech-prefixes. Professor Wilson is no doubt right in thinking that what he calls 'the muddle of the three Sallies' depends upon abbreviated prefixes. But why should these not have been written, as those in *Sir Thomas More* are supposed to have been, by Shakespeare? How does it help the matter to suppose that Scribe *A* wrote them against his transcripts from the parts, and Scribe *B* expanded some of them wrongly? If Scribe *A* had parts like the only one we know, his only clue was a name in full at the top of one or more strips of the part-roll. Why should he abbreviate, merely for someone else to expand by conjecture? In particular Professor Wilson thinks that the Gobbo of the stage-direction and prefixes of *II, ii* is a mistaken correction of Scribe *B*, who knew Italian, for the Iobbe of the text, which he takes for the Italian *Giobbe* = Job. I am not sure how he thinks it stood in *A*'s prefixes, or why *B* did not alter the text as well as the prefixes. In any case, Gobbo is probably right, and Iobbe a misprint. The name Gobbo was known in England; it occurs in the registers of Titchfield in Hampshire. It means 'hunchback.' Professor Wilson says that this is 'pointless as applied either to Lancelot or his father.' But we do not know how old Gobbo was 'made up.' Curiously enough, there are two letters of Francis Davison to his father, which refer to an unnamed enemy of the Earl of Essex (T. Birch, *Memoirs of the Reign of Elizabeth*, *II*, pp. 185, 204). In one he says of Essex:

If he be vanquished...all the world shall never make me confess but that bum-basted legs are a better fortification than bulwarks and St Gobbo a far greater and more omnipotent saint than either St Philip or St Diego.

Later he writes of 'the late instalment and canonisation of the venerable saint.' The reference must be to Robert Cecil, who had one shoulder higher than the other, and was made Secretary of State, in spite of opposition from the Essex faction, in 1596. (The letters were written in November 1596, the year to which I assign *The Merchant*.) I think it may have suggested the nick-name—not of course that Shakespeare meant Gobbo for Cecil.

I accept Professor Wilson's ingenious theory, based upon a misplaced catchword, and confirmed independently by Dr Greg, that the intrusion of Lancelot in *v, i* was an interpolation from a margin or appended slip. Of course it may just as well have been an interpolation in the original prompt-copy as in a reconstructed one. But he goes on to argue that,

'if an addition was made at one place, why not at others?' And this hardly justifies him in scanning the play, to see if he can brand as an interpolation anything else which he thinks unworthy of Shakespeare, such as the bit of indecency in III, ii, 216-20. While he was about it, he might just as well have ruled out III, iv, 78-80 and v, i, 236-7. We cannot acquit Shakespeare of such things. Still less can I believe that 'Shakespeare had no hand whatever' in III, v. Professor Wilson suggests that the prose opening, in which Lancelot is accused of immoral relations with a negro woman, of whom there is no further mention in the play, was written by William Kempe. It is not pretty, but much of the surrounding fooling seems Shakespearian, and I think that the allusion may be fourth-dimensional. Then comes Lorenzo's speech:

O dear discretion, how his words are suited!
The fool hath planted in his memory
An army of good words; and I do know
A many fools, that stand in better place,
Garnish'd like him, that for a tricky word
Defy the matter.

Here Professor Wilson amazes me. The passage 'was written by some second-rate poet as a compliment to William Kempe,' and 'the reference to "A many fools, that stand in better place" is obviously intended as a hit at some successful rival.' It obviously is not; it is a hit at the talkative fribbles of society. Professor Wilson does not dwell upon the rest of the scene, although the whole is included in his condemnation. We are, then, to attribute to another than Shakespeare Jessica's speech, with its fine ending:

Why, if two gods should play some heavenly match
And on the wager lay two earthly women,
And Portia one, there must be something else
Pawn'd with the other, for the poor rude world
Hath not her fellow.

Is it Kempe, or the 'second-rate poet'?

I see no clear reason why the Quarto of 1600 should not have been printed from Shakespeare's copy. It has some at least of the peculiarities of spelling, of which Professor Wilson made an analysis for *Hamlet*. And it is a good text, requiring little emendation, so far as the actual words go. Professor Wilson admits fewer variations from it than did Clark and Wright, who were misled by the supposed authority of the alternative Quarto, which also bears the date 1600, but is now known to be of 1619. And I think that some of those which he does admit are uncalled for, e.g. in II, i, 31, where Rowe's 'To win thee, lady' has no claims over the Quarto's 'To win the lady.' The Quarto's 'fledge' (III, i, 32) and 'bleake' (IV, i, 74), again, seem to be good dialectal forms, and should not be replaced by 'fledge' and 'bleate.' Professor Wilson has not much room for his own considerable talent in emendation. In II, i, 35, where the Quarto has:

So is Alcides beaten by his rage,

he suggests 'wag' in place of Theobald's 'page,' which he thinks

'impossible palaeographically, *p* and *r* being quite unlike in English script.' The point may be good, although I regret 'page.' But has Professor Wilson forgotten that for him the script is not Shakespeare's and therefore not necessarily English?

E. K. CHAMBERS.

OXFORD.

Venus and Anchises and other Poems by Phineas Fletcher. Edited from a Sion College MS. for the Royal Society of Literature by ETHEL SEATON. With a Preface by F. S. BOAS. London: H. Milford. 1926. li + 125 pp., with 4 facsimiles. 10s. 6d.

In *The Times Literary Supplement* for 22 March 1923, Miss Ethel Seaton made known her discovery in Sion College Library of a manuscript of poems by Phineas Fletcher; now she completes our debt by the issue of a diplomatic copy of the manuscript, with introduction, textual collation, and a brief commentary. The seven poems it contains are: *Venus and Anchises*, published in 1628 under the title of *Brittain's Ida* and ascribed to Spenser; a hitherto unknown *Epithalamium*; the poem *To Mr Jo. Tomkins* of the 1623 Quarto, here called *Non Invisa Cano*; and Nos. IV, VI, II, and V of the *Piscatorie Eclogs*, in this order. The manuscript is not in Fletcher's hand, but, as it is almost certainly earlier than the printed versions, it has some authority and is of great though varying interest.

The importance of *Venus and Anchises*, apart from the authorisation of a comprehensible title—what did Walkley mean by *Brittain's Ida*, if anything?—lies in the addition of four stanzas, the disappearance of the inept pseudo-Spenserian division into doggerel-headed 'Cantos,' and the new certainty of Phineas Fletcher's authorship. For it opens with two stanzas which do not appear in the 1628 edition, perhaps for the very reason that they declare the author to be 'Thirsil,' well known to be Fletcher in poetic disguise. Thus Grosart's attribution to Fletcher may be held as proved—though it remains doubtful whether this success will engender such confidence in 'internal evidence' in general as Dr Boas seems to hope for. This straightforward piece of sensuous paganism lacks, quite strikingly, the complexity of interests that appears in all Spenser wrote, and though Miss Seaton notes that copies of *Brittain's Ida* still appear in catalogues under Spenser's name, that merely shows that the business mind has not altered much since Walkley's time. None the less it is satisfactory to find Grosart's acuteness, and Dr Boas's, justified by later evidence.

The largest portion of new matter in the volume is the *Epithalamium*, like *Venus and Anchises* warm and sensuous, directly after the common manner of the Latin epithalamia of the Renaissance. Special thanks are owing to Miss Seaton for this addition to the canon of a new poem of considerable beauty and of a formal elaboration unusual in Fletcher. The interest of the other five poems, except for the replacement of a missing line in the address to Tomkins, lies in the variants clearly due

to the poet's own revision. The easy flow of Spenserian verse is not achieved without 'labour and learning,' and here we have a glimpse of Fletcher at work. The uncertain syntax of stanza 2 of *Non Invisa Cano* may arise from an intermediate revision completed in the Quarto text, and throughout the Eclogs there are alterations of wording, especially in the epigrammatic couplets which close the stanzas. Fletcher's tendency is towards simplification of the rhetorical turns; as Miss Seaton points out, the vocabulary remains Spenserian, since the excision of the dialectal verb *to skise* (which is rather a pity!) is balanced by the insertion of the archaic *lozel*.

In her introduction Miss Seaton adds something to our knowledge of Fletcher's life by proving an earlier connexion with Norfolk, and the new additions suggest an earlier date for Fletcher's poetic activity as a whole. The whole volume might well be set to advanced students for detailed study. They would learn more about poetic style from it than from many porings over perfection. And from Miss Seaton's admirable work they would learn to appreciate care, lucidity, and that discretion which grows increasingly rare even among scholars.

W. L. RENWICK.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

Fielding the Novelist: A Study in Historical Criticism. By FREDERIC T. BLANCHARD. New Haven: Yale University Press; London, H. Milford. 1926. xiv + 655 pp. 30s.

This is an excellent piece of auxiliary criticism. The species, though now so abundant, can hardly be half a century old. Sainte-Beuve said that a critic must equip himself in the history of an author's reputation; but it was long before such tasks were tackled in the spirit of science or with the rigour of the law. A book like Professor Blanchard's is now essential for the literary historian. The writer must have endless patience, dig in many dust-heaps, elude all manner of traps, be rigidly accurate in dating and verifying, and must possess, above all, a sense of perspective. Mr Blanchard has these qualities, and his work surely never need be done again. He has evidently been trained in one of the strict American schools, whose ideal is the perfect thesis—that priceless but almost unbearable product of the human mind. He has retained the virtues of the discipline, and we feel we can trust him; but he also manages to be pleasant, readable, and clear. He is, to be candid, not very concise; and he repeats himself considerably, as we professional teachers are apt to do for the benefit of the flock. But this sounds ungrateful; and the 580 pages of text, flanked by some seventy more of bibliography and index, are hardly too many for so rich a subject. Mr Blanchard has had behind him a great collection of Fielding material in the Yale library; and he has naturally used and acknowledged fully Professor Cross's massive biography. But he has spent years in searching for himself, and has brought his story down to 1918, the date of Mr Cross's work, and even later. His book is an indispensable companion to that

valuable *Life*; and Mr Blanchard, who is Professor of English in the University of California (Southern Branch), deserves all thanks. The portraits, facsimile title-pages, and drawings by Corbould, Stothard, Cruickshank, and others, are very welcome. In the long list of 'works about Fielding' the title-pages are reduced to essentials; and the author 'hopes to bring out later, as a separate volume, a comprehensive bibliography.'

The first ten chapters describe the reputation of Fielding during the eighteenth century. Much new light is thrown on this confusing subject. The first stage concerns the novelist's lifetime, and four main points emerge more clearly than before. (1) The popular voice greeted Fielding almost from the first; and, after the appearance of *Tom Jones*, most unmistakably. This we knew already from the list of editions, and from the pages of Cross; but the evidence is greatly expanded. There are also what Mr Blanchard well calls the 'concessions' of Fielding's 'most eminent detractors.' (2) But they were eminent, and the higher literary class, as a whole, was chilly or hostile. There were honourable exceptions; and Miss Elizabeth Carter stands out as a sturdy defender of Fielding from first to last. She saw the truth about him better than Johnson, Gray, Walpole, Chesterfield, Lady Mary, and Smollett, all put together. And the praise of Christopher Smart, in verse and prose, we now see to have been worth having. He hit the mark when he said that 'every scene of life is represented in its natural colours.' (3) We realise more fully what cartful of gutter-invective and malignant calumny Fielding had to face from the underworld of letters. True, he in some sense, as we say, 'asked for it'; he was unluckily entangled, as Mr Cross has so fully recited, in theatrical, journalistic, and political squabbles. But again, he entered them partly as a social reformer and campaigner; and, with the exception of his rather unworthy tilts against Colley Cibber, he fought fair though he hit hard. Yet the mud stuck to his personal reputation for the best part of a century. (4) 'The history of Fielding's fame is the story of the rivalry between his works and those of Richardson' (p. 76). I cannot here even indicate the wealth of Mr Blanchard's documents, but one is most significant. We, looking back, instinctively think of *Joseph Andrews* as exposing and exploding the dubious ethics of *Pamela*. So it does; but so, at the time, it did not. The rage for *Pamela* was unchecked. And, though *Andrews* sold well enough, no one saw that it was the book which had set the English novel fairly on its feet. Again, the rivalry was not so much between the artists personally as between their writings. Fielding, after *Joseph Andrews*, never thought of himself, so far as we can see, as competing with Richardson, and praised him handsomely; Richardson nearly always hissed at Fielding with catlike spite, and sincerely thought him a bad man, a bad writer, and above all far too popular.

But the struggle was not simply a literary one. It was a struggle between two codes of behaviour and two incompatible views of human life. We are here in deeper waters, and come on a real inner discord in

the eighteenth century, which is so often baptised (even by Mr Blanchard) as formal, complacent, conventional, and the like, but which was in truth a time of seething mental conflict and of breach with convention. Broadly speaking, the century, at any rate down to about 1770, voted for Richardson, while the nineteenth century, or at least the twentieth, has voted for Fielding. The statement of course has to be qualified at both extremes. Mr Blanchard dates the 'turning of the tide' from the issue of the collected edition of 1762. It turned, in spite of the harm done by Murphy's notorious memoir; but it was slow in reaching the literary class; and Gibbon's great compliment was, even when he wrote, in some sense a protest. Even Fielding's votaries saw little of his depth and irony, or of the strength that he held in reserve. It was long before the noble quality of *Amelia* was perceived, and the *Voyage to Lisbon* was in the same case. All this comes out luminously in Mr Blanchard's story. The interest of the sequel, to which eight chapters are allotted, is great but of another kind. Of Fielding's own age we ask, How could it both produce so great a writer, and misjudge him? Because his picture was too true? Or because, while steeped in the life of his time, he stood away from it and thought ahead of it? 'He was far in advance of the tendencies of his own genteel and formal age' (p. 139). The two questions are perhaps the same. In any case, the work and its reception belong to a single chapter of history. It is otherwise when later generations take up the work of assessment, and the life that the novelist portrays is concerned with what is (or, to speak more accurately, *seems*) a departed society. Mr Blanchard's review of this modern phase is as carefully documented as ever, and he puts together masses of fresh material; but I must not linger over it. The true critical departure, in spite of the unique and unsurpassed comments of Coleridge, began late in the last century, and was due chiefly to the biographers. Austin Dobson did most to clear the portrait of Fielding from the stains daubed over it. The names of Saintsbury, Gosse, and others stand out as continuing the task. The biography of Mr Cross, though slightly on the roseate side, may be said to have completed it, and Mr Blanchard now provides the whole history of Fielding's reputation.

I only venture to add three criticisms of detail. (1) Is it not too much of a conjecture to suggest that Johnson 'silently and effectually' worked against Fielding (p. 189, and see pp. 36, 92) on the *Gentleman's Magazine*, and was responsible for its coldness or hostility? We know what weight he carried with Cave, and how he disparaged Fielding (not indeed, as Mr Blanchard truly points out (p. 198, etc.), by any means in an unqualified way—though he is termed Fielding's 'implacable detractor' on p. 11). But it was not like him to work 'silently,' in other words meanly. (2) The contemporary views of *Jonathan Wild*, though often alluded to, are not worked out in the same formal way as in the case of the other novels. Is it not to be counted as a novel? Or was it in fact little noticed? The recent enquiries and collations of M. Digeon have made that sombre and splendid book more interesting than ever.

(3) It is no part of Mr Blanchard's plan to put himself forward, but he is rather too modest. His attitude is plain enough, and at the close he gives us a rather high-pitched but general eulogy of Fielding. But his judicious *obiter dicta* suggest that he might well add himself to the list of his authorities, and complete his study in 'historical criticism' by a fuller, independent analysis, made regardless of the history of opinion.

OLIVER ELTON.

OXFORD.

Die englische Literatur des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts. Mit einer Einführung in die englische Frühromantik. Von Dr BERNHARD FEHR. (*Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft.*) Berlin: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion. 524 pp.

This is a remarkable and important book. Intended primarily for the German-speaking public, it offers something also which, taken as a whole, no English scholar has yet provided, and which ought promptly to be made accessible to English readers. Professor Elton's admirable 'Surveys' cover only one century, and they close on the threshold of the period, from 1880 onwards, upon which critical guidance, even if it do no more than supply clues to the welter, is most needed and most difficult to give. Authoritative opinion is here still in the making, biography often uncertain or unknown, careers incomplete, and their final significance undetermined. And time has scarcely yet begun the sifting process which enables the literary historian of earlier periods to pass lightly over movements and men who once filled noisy years but who left nothing of mark behind. The noisy years are still with us, and the English critic will be the first to welcome the aid of a detached and unbiassed foreign scholar in distinguishing the enduring from the ephemeral notes and defining their timbre and tone. We have of course a mass of excellent criticism of this period, as well as a few books which attempt to give a continuous history of the literature of the nineties, or of the years from 1900 to the outbreak of the war. But we incline to think that none of these equals in critical weight or in scholarly thoroughness the account given of this entire difficult period, in some 220 large folio pages, by this Zürich professor. If comparison is to be made, it must be with another recent gift of foreign scholarship, on a smaller scale, the corresponding chapters of MM. Legouis and Cazamian's *Histoire de la Littérature anglaise*, to which Prof. Fehr offers a chivalrous salute at the close of his own book. Certainly no young modernist whether in poetry, drama, or novel, will complain that this foreign contemporary is not in intellectual sympathy with the literature of these later days. A case to the opposite effect might rather be made out when he regrets the literary conservatism of the poet laureate. But even where his valuation seems to ignore some high merits, it is difficult to quarrel with its terms. And his undisguised admiration for much of the later work always stops far on this side of idolatry. After a vivid and

intimate account of the 'Five-Towns' (illustrated by a no less vivid 'Chimney-concert' of Joseph Pennell's) and their portrayer, he concludes by adopting Henry James's incisive remark that Bennett's imposing monument wants profile and totality. 'We dismiss his work with the great unanswered question: "What does it mean?"'

In Galsworthy, on the other hand, he recognises, naturally, hints of a philosophic interpretation of life, 'without which no great narrative art is possible'; and only reproves the aristocratic reticence which so rarely allows it expression. Mr Fehr's critical sense ignores none of the elements which go to the making of literature, but he is not one of those for whom simple song or story entirely suffices. And we find it hard to detect any aspect or note in the complex diversity of our modernist literature to which he does not bring the sensitive apprehension of a catholic criticism. Much of the poetry so profusely put forth during the last generation detaches itself sharply, as English poetry has always been prone to do, from the types and standards accepted on the continent; and no English critic who has something of the European mind will hastily dismiss the question: 'Is this insularity, or discovery? Are we provincials, or pioneers?' One recalls Taine's sweeping transvaluation of our values, and Brandes's relegation of Wordsworth and Coleridge to a limbo in the shadow of Byron. Professor Fehr's critical intelligence is too supple and too scholarly for these peremptory methods. In poetry and drama so evasive, for instance, in its delicate essence as that of the 'Celtic Renaissance,' he finds a poetic new birth, not insular waywardness. Meredith's verse is more exacting, and Mr Fehr's readiness to dismiss its doctrine will scarcely satisfy the esoteric Meredithian. But with German thoroughness he sets forth the connexion of his ideas with those of Comte; finding him, however, to be, above all, a great proclaimer of beauty, and putting 'Love in the Valley' in the front rank not only of his own but of all English lyrics. For Meredith, as for a host of other noble 'provincials' of our poetry, Mr Fehr has thus provided a very effectual safe-conduct across the North Sea. But there is a perceptible difference in his tone, an access of geniality and gusto, when he comes to speak of a writer long securely established there. His chapter on Mr Shaw occupies 12 out of the 35 folio pages devoted to the entire British drama since 1880. It is an admirable piece of work, too indulgent perhaps to intellectual foibles of which we are possibly too acutely conscious here, but searching in analysis and consequent in synthesis, and equal we think, as a critical estimate, to anything yet written upon Shaw, on a similar scale, in English.

If Fehr's account of the last 45 years is the most important section of his book, this is not because he is less competent or well-read in the earlier periods, but merely because he is there dealing with matter on which a vastly greater body of able, if not final, critical work, English and foreign, has already been done. His Nineteenth Century is as carefully wrought as his Twentieth, and we are even led up to it by a succinct but illuminating study of the incipient Romanticism (here rather ambiguously

called 'Preromantik') of the Eighteenth Century, from Lady Winchilsea onwards.

Of the great poets of the Romantic generation, Shelley has of late years attracted devoted and able students in all parts of Europe; he is now hardly more insular than Byron. Wordsworth and Blake put a foreign critic's catholicity to a severer test. If we say that Professor Fehr satisfies this test, we do not mean that he would win the complete approval of the more thoroughgoing disciples of either. But the high priests of the cult of Blake will, we think, award a discreet and guarded recognition to the author of the important chapter, 10 folio pages long, devoted to him. 'Blake's world,' as shadowed forth for us in the grandiose symbols of the Prophetic Books and the later poems, is delineated with insight and power, and English as well as continental readers will appreciate the many fine illustrations from Blake's drawings and engraved books. His Wordsworth, on the other hand, though thorough and scholarly, suffers a little from the very competence of the critic's analysis. The poet lends himself so plausibly to certain obvious categories, his 'nature-worship' is so easily classed as a variety of Rousseauism, his idealism as an application of Plato, that the poet of whom Dr A. C. Bradley has said that 'there have been greater poets, but no poet was ever more original,' escapes both explanation and recognition. Mr Fehr seems indeed to overstate the conscious influence of Plato upon him. In the Immortality Ode he deliberately called in the Platonic doctrine of a prenatal existence. But his idealism was his own, as he tells us, from boyhood, an instinctive faith, before he had ever heard Plato's name. But such slight cavils are merely by the way. Mr Fehr has done a distinguished service to all students of our later literature, English as well as foreign. For a very large proportion of the illustrations—portraits, title-pages, caricatures, old engravings and medals, dwellings and birth-places—with which it is profusely provided, are just as inaccessible to the ordinary student here as abroad, and just as unknown. They are almost throughout of rare excellence.

C. H. HERFORD.

MANCHESTER.

Études sur le Tristan en Prose. Les Sources. Les Manuscrits. Bibliographie critique. Par EUGÈNE VINAVER. Paris: É. Champion. 1925. 98 pp. 12 fr.

Anyone who contemplates research on the Tristan prose romances in French must be prepared for a formidable amount of preliminary reading. There are forty-eight manuscripts, all containing divergent versions, and nine printed editions, the last issued in 1586, to say nothing of the recent books and articles on various aspects of the subject which have to be assimilated before the student is *au courant* of the work that has been already done. M. Eugène Vinaver has not been discouraged by the herculean task, and has done much to clear the way for future labourers, while making no claim to have answered finally the

question of the original form of the prose romance. After studying the sources, he attempts a fresh classification of the MSS., and then offers a critical bibliography of all the MSS., editions and critical studies.

With regard to the sources, M. Vinaver confines himself to the pure *Tristan* tradition common to the poems of Thomas, Béroul and of Eilhart von Oberge, and to the prose romances, leaving out of consideration the fragments of chivalrous romances (*Quête du Saint Graal*, *Palamède*, *Mort Artu*, etc.) which are found embedded in the prose *Tristan*, as well as other additions due to the author. That is to say, he deals with only a small proportion of the whole romance, about one-fiftieth part according to his calculation. He follows M. Joseph Bédier, in his celebrated study of the *Tristan* of Thomas, in inferring the source of the *Tristan* story to have been, not a collection of lays, but one original work of perfect unity in its creation, from which the poems and the prose romance are alike derived. While not going so far as to see, with M. Bédier, a regular progression in the development of the characters, he finds a proof of the unity of inspiration in the harmony between the various external incidents of the story on the one hand, and the dramatic march of events on the other. The diagram of the 'double mouvement mécanique et dramatique' on page 9 is perhaps not very convincing; each event before the culminating point of the life of the lovers in the forest of Morois is made to have its pendant, in the reverse order, in their subsequent history, the last message of *Tristan* to *Iseut* (the appeal to come in a vessel with a white sail) corresponding to the first message of *Iseut* to *Tristan* by means of a golden hair.

A careful notice is given to the *Tristan and Isolt* of G. Schoepperle, who believed the archetype of Thomas, Béroul and Eilhart to be a courtly poem differing in origin from the version of the prose romances, which was probably older, or at least independent. In this latter, *Iseut aux Blanchés Mains* does not appear in the death-scene, *Tristan* being mortally wounded by *Marc* in the presence of *Iseut la Blonde*. The American scholar infers that in the original of the prose romance there were only three main figures, the husband, the wife and the lover. Such divergences are attributed by M. Vinaver to the taste of the period; he has no hesitation in believing that the prose *Tristan* emanates from the same source as the poems.

In dealing with the classification of the MSS. M. Vinaver holds that that of Löseth (*Roman en prose de Tristan*, 1890) is the only one worthy of acceptance; there are two great classes of versions in the twenty-four MSS. of the Bibliothèque Nationale; the first keeps the original story in its less mutilated form, while the second, the 'version cyclique,' characterised by long interpolations and lacunae, is in the main the authority for the prose romance. A genealogical table, in which several MSS. appear which are not noticed by Löseth, concludes this section.

In connexion with the third section, the critical bibliography, it may perhaps be permissible to add a word with reference to two MSS. which M. Vinaver was not able personally to consult. The first of these, quoted

on p. 51, the *Roman de Tristan* of the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh (now the National Library of Scotland), noticed by Paul Meyer in *Archives des Missions Scientifiques* for 1867, and in the *Documents Manuscrits de l'ancienne littérature de la France conservés dans les Bibliothèques de la Grande Bretagne*, 1871, was mentioned by M. Meyer to me as never having been studied. I have since had the opportunity of reading this MS. carefully, partly in Edinburgh, and more recently through the kindness of Mr William Dickson, of the National Library of Scotland, who lent it to the British Museum for the purpose, and it appears to me to be well worth studying, both on account of its language (the Lorraine dialect), and also for the sake of various lays and episodes incorporated in it which are not found in the other MSS. as analysed by Löseth. It bears in common with others of the Tristan prose romances the name of *le Bret*, which is explained by Gaston Paris (*Merlin*, Société des Anciens Textes Français, 1886) as being a confusion for *le Brait*, the history of the imprisonment of Merlin and the Cry uttered by the sorcerer, with which Tristan episodes were mingled. The second MS. upon which I desire to add a note is the Grenoble 866, supposed to be a fragment of a prose *Tristan* in the *Catalogue général des MSS. des Bibliothèques publiques de France*, VII, p. 260, but queried by M. Vinaver, and of which Löseth admits that he has not found the incident it contains in any Paris MS., though he sees a parallel in the story of King Marc (in Bibl. Nat. Fr. 24400) watching the fisher arriving in his island. Through the kindness of Mr R. T. Butlin of University College, London, who was in Grenoble last summer and was good enough to copy the entire fragment, I have been able to satisfy myself at least that its tone is entirely different from that both of the pure Tristan story and also from that of the adventitious matter due to the later taste for sentiment and adventure. Its note of mystical devotion to the Cross seems to me to belong rather to the real Arthurian tradition than to the Tristan¹.

A definite contribution has been made by M. Vinaver's work to the task of determining the origin of the prose *Tristan*. Not only does the author recognise that the prose romance is a barbarous transformation of the primitive story with its simple human beauty, but he studies its very defects as reflections of the ideas and tastes of the epoch in which the prose versions of the Breton legends occupied a place of honour in the literary world.

F. C. JOHNSON.

LONDON.

Alfred de Vigny. Par MARC CITOLEUX. (*Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature comparée*, Tome XVII.) Paris: É. Champion. 1924. xvii + 654 pp. 35 fr.

M. Citoleux has here attempted to do two things, both of which wanted doing. Vigny has a very French trick of 'working up' his themes and pushing them to their logical or rather to their artistic conclusions.

¹ I hope to print the Grenoble fragment in the next number of this *Review*.

He sets out, in the 'Colère de Samson,' to give poetic expression to a very intimate personal experience. But the poem, as it grows, refashions that experience and exaggerates it. So that the conclusion: 'Car la femme est un être impur de corps et d'âme,' is more a thing of logical fitness than the statement of Vigny's opinion. That is one example. But there are many and they contradict each other, or would do if interpreted too literally. This overstatement is a habit of the Romantics. M. Lanson noticed it in Lamartine; and it is the very secret of Hugo's magic. In fact, all poetry is inherently untrue. Life sublimated in this way is delightful, but it is no longer life. The dilution and compromise of everyday happenings and everyday thought are absent from it. This is particularly true of Vigny. At one time he sees the soldier as a slave, at another as a hero. He is an optimist and he is a pessimist. He is a Christian and he is an atheist. He is a democrat and an aristocrat. In short, he seems to be the essence of paradox, if each of his utterances be given its full rhetorical value, and a very queer fellow indeed to coax into any critical waistcoat. M. Citoleux has tried to reconcile Vigny with himself. The upshot of his enquiry is that the essential quality of the man and the poet is 'ponderation.' The word is not particularly eloquent. It may explain to us why Vigny was not quite a great poet and not quite a great thinker. But it does not explain how he came near being the one and the other. M. Citoleux may be right. But, at the moment, we are inclined to think that his conclusion was suggested by his own method, rather than by the subject on which it was exercised.

At any rate, an unspontaneous poet is a poet whose 'sources' ought to be traceable. And a great part of the present volume is taken up with the records of this search. It is the second of the things M. Citoleux set himself to do. One cannot but be grateful for such labours. He has read, not much, but enormously; and many of his finds will help the textual critics. Unfortunately, this wealth of erudition is not held together by a compelling argument, nor sustained by very impressive criticism. It is too often apparent that, having made up his mind where to look for sources, he was determined to bring home a creditable bag. Some of his parallels rest on words or notions which have little foothold in the spiritual lives of the authors he quotes. Mme de Staël, were she to come to life again, might remember M. de Serbellane and Mme d'Ervins, two nebulous personages in her novel *Delphine*. But she certainly would not remember that she borrowed a commonplace from lovers' talk of all time and, in her peculiar jargon, made Serbellane say: 'Je me replacerai au milieu de la nature avec un être aimable qui partagera toutes mes impressions.' Both she and Vigny would have been surprised to learn that that sentence was one of the latter's sources for 'La Maison du Berger.' At that rate, everything is the source of anything. We do not mean that M. Citoleux is always equally unfortunate. By no means. But this source-hunting is perilous work, as well as useful. It requires a literary sense of uncanny acuteness, no less than historical zeal. M. Citoleux has more of the second than of the first.

There are graver objections, however, to M. Citoleux's book than any we have yet stated. It would have been better, in our view, to have kept Vigny's sources and Vigny's ideas more apart. Doubtless the two things are related: but they are not the same thing. One result of mingling the two together is that we see the relation between these ideas and their sources, but not the bond between the ideas themselves. There is no gradually emerging picture of Vigny's thought as a whole. And this is the more distressing as M. Citoleux, probably because of academic scrupulousness, has cut off Vigny's ideas from the fabric of his life. He would reply that Vigny's life had been already 'done.' But a book is a book and subject to laws which are not academic. M. Citoleux's business was to convince the reader, not by argument, but by evidence. He has not only suppressed half the evidence: he has destroyed the human value of the other half. The ideas of a professional philosopher may perhaps be treated thus and suffer no harm. But a poet's ideas are sense-inspired, tender things that are mere dead leaves when plucked from their stem. M. Citoleux stirs manfully amongst these leaves. But the life that ought to inform his pages is not there. There are no facts to talk for themselves and save the reader occasionally from the desolation of abstraction.

Indeed, we are forced against our will to confess it, reading M. Citoleux is no easy matter. It requires the type of genius defined by Carlyle as the capacity for taking infinite pains. His style is dull: and that is no small matter as there are over 600 pages of it and a very inadequate summary to guide the reader who would like to skip some of them and get to the heart of the matter quickly. The book does not progress as books should. It shuffles backwards and forwards. On one page, Vigny is an old man and on the next he is a boy again. This sort of thing discourages even the professional reader. A nice style is the gift of God. But a little benevolent cunning in the architecture of a book is a thing that can be learned. We say so out of sheer regret that M. Citoleux's real wisdom and learning should have suffered so much from the lack of it.

D. G. LARG.

LONDON.

Edgar Poe et les Premiers Symbolistes français. Par LOUIS SEYLAZ.

Lausanne: Imprimerie de la Concorde. 1923. 184 pp.

After having been the subject of several studies in the early years of the present century, Poe's ideas and æsthetic theories are again coming to the fore, if one may judge by the number of books and articles recently published on the man and his work, and by the fact that his example was freely invoked in a recent controversy anent 'la poésie pure.'

M. Seylaz's book constitutes a valuable addition to the knowledge of Poe's influence on nineteenth-century French poetry. While incorporating the results of previous studies on Poe and French literature, this work goes further and, besides marking the points of contact between the

American poet and the symbolists, traces the development of his ideas and theories from the moment of their appearance in France until the end of last century. At the same time it elucidates their germinating principle and measures the action to be attributed on the one hand to the creative work, on the other to the theories of Poe, in forming the talent of Baudelaire, Mallarmé, Villiers de l'Isle Adam, and through them, the reaction on the symbolist school.

A rapid sketch of the poet brings him before us, tragically alone, amid the 'roquets de la morale,' utilitarians with little or no sympathy to spare for an artistic ideal which ignored the moral element and replaced it by purely æsthetic considerations. In this hostile environment Poe developed his strange dual personality: the emotional, visionary, neurotic self, submitted to the relentless examination of cold reason. Quoting in illustration of this curious psychological phenomenon the pages in which Poe analyses the composition of *The Raven*, M. Seylaz refuses, very rightly, to regard the passage as a mere mystification. He then expounds briefly what may be termed Poe's philosophy, or, more modestly, his general ideas: belief in intuition as opposed to reason, scepticism with regard to democracy and progress, certain rapid divinations of the abysses of human nature.

After settling, by a patient scrutiny of the periodicals of the time, the vexed question of the exact date at which the first translations of Poe appeared in France, the author deals at some length with the relations of Poe and Baudelaire, skilfully demonstrating the nature and extent of the American writer's action on the ideas, the poetry and the æsthetic theories of his disciple. If the impression produced by the poetry of the two men is so dissimilar it is because Baudelaire has, generally speaking, while freely borrowing devices of prosody and versification, taken his matter more often from the prose tales than from the poetry. The most striking debt is certainly the theory of the parallelism of colours and sounds: this basic principle of the symbolists Baudelaire probably owed to a note in the *Marginalia*, though, as M. Seylaz admits, a passage in Hoffmann's *Kreiseriana* may have had its share in crystallising the theory.

The whole question of Poe and Baudelaire is treated in a clear and interesting fashion. While carefully bringing together parallel passages, the critic accepts no crude hypothesis of plagiarism, but realises that the strength of the influence exercised lies in an essential kinship of spirit. He carefully differentiates, moreover, the action of the imaginative work of Poe and that of his æsthetic doctrine. Nor does he deny a share in the evolution of Baudelaire's ideal to others than the subject of his study, indicating the claims of Gautier, Sainte-Beuve the poet, and Delacroix for instance, to the title of predecessors.

To the student of comparative literature the real interest of the problem lies in the deviation of Poe's theory and practice when adopted by a poet whose temperament, for all the apparent kinship, is not that of the American. The 'other-worldness' of Poe is reduced to more human

proportions. It would seem that the French temperament instinctively strives to bring the supernatural nearer to earth, to substitute what is physical for what is psychical. Expressing itself in a language which does not possess the vagueness and suggestiveness inherent in English and favourable to poetry, the French mind generally appears somewhat loath to soar into those regions where reason must be abandoned for dim intuitions. Baudelaire, seeking to give expression to sentiments which his predecessors had, in the main, neglected for the more accessible sunlit regions of consciousness, certainly enlarged the sphere of French poetry. Less inclined than Poe to launch into uncharted seas, he marks nevertheless a new spirit, so different from what had gone before that to some among the moderns, poetry, in the full sense of the word, dates, in France, from the appearance of *Les Fleurs du Mal*.

FREDERICK C. ROE.

ST ANDREWS.

El Pensamiento de Cervantes. Por AMÉRICO CASTRO. (*Revista de Filología Española*. Anejo VI.) Madrid: Hernando. 1925. 406 pp. 11 ptas.

The study of Cervantes' thought now completed had its genesis in the researches into the Calderonian Code of Honour, published by Professor Castro ten years ago. He then noticed that Cervantes' views (his condemnation of vengeance, his scepticism about external honour, his sympathy with the woman as more victim than deceiver) were strikingly different from and more humane than the fashionable doctrines of the dramatists; they were not humane for merely sentimental reasons, but belonged to a particular mental attitude, that of a consistent Humanist. As Dr Castro has never shirked difficult studies that others avoid with apprehension, he proceeded to examine the whole of Cervantes' ideology on the basis of Humanism. He was met at the outset by the dogma which he had himself subscribed to under the guidance of almost all Cervantists and critics, namely that Cervantes was a man of 'escasa doctrina,' a sort of organ-pipe which, after the wind of his great inspiration had passed by, was as empty as before. But Professor Castro has no difficulty in showing that all such opinions are based on the æsthetic discrepancy between Cervantes' masterpieces and his dramas and pastorals, for which he shows a strange preference: besides, it is doubtful whether pedantry has yet forgiven him for making a mock of prefaces crammed with Latin tags!

Isolating the intellectual interest of Cervantes' work, Dr Castro finds that his ideology was fixed during the Lepanto period and was not substantially altered in later years. It is a body of Humanistic doctrine, remarkable, not for originality, but for its coherence. Humanism reached Cervantes through sources such as Erasmus, Pomponazzi, Robortelli, el Pinciano, Mal Lara, etc. An enemy of all that was abnormal, Cervantes adopted the fiction of a semi-divine and quasi-personal Nature as the vicegerent of the Deity, to whom he reserved any irrational or supra-rational attribute that might please the theologian. The rule of life is

Concordance with the Law of Nature. Dissonance brings suffering, for the punishment is implicit in the act. Dr Castro illustrates the effect of Dissonance in Cervantes' characters, particularly in unhappy marriages and their consequences: the infidelity of the wife in *El Curioso Impertinente* is, for instance, the inevitable outcome of the *disonancia* of her husband who insists on a particular interpretation of conjugal fidelity that is contrary to the Law of Nature. Profoundly didactic as Cervantes is in all questions of æsthetics, morals, politics, religion that fall within his purview, his consistent rationalism makes him not infrequently amoral, if not immoral. It certainly brings him into collision with theological dogma: he prefers marriage without banns, condones adultery, rationalises miracles, partly believes in astrology (though less in medicine), and traverses the doctrine of original sin by his postulate of a Nature that tends to good alone. He subscribes to the whole creed of Trent, but consistently ignores 'teologías.' Trent has no consequences for his characters. The Nature he postulates is typified in the flawless Golden Age and approximates to the pastoral convention, which he, on that account, prefers as a nearer approach to ideal Truth. But Cervantes belongs to a disillusioned age, and his criticism keeps breaking in. He cannot fail to oppose real shepherds to those of Sanazzaro and Montemayor, real innkeepers to the chimæras of knights errant. In the lesser works this critical faculty is never wholly in abeyance, but in the *Quixote* it is the heart of the action, the battle of the author's own soul. Criticism requires that the author stand outside his creation; Cervantes could never get inside the skin of a dramatic character and for that reason yielded the 'comic monarchy' to the variable Lope de Vega.

Dr Castro's 406 pages are crowded with ingenious observations which we have no space to notice, but something must be said of his methods. Cervantes' erudition is not a collection of tags, more or less easily recognised, but a thoroughly assimilated doctrine which rises into print as occasion requires. There is little consecutive exposition. The texts have to be collected from all sides and classified: they are to be classified in relation to their immediate sources (Aristotelian æsthetics, e.g., with relation to Pinciano or Robortelli, not Aristotle), when their implications will appear. But the Renaissance thinkers lived before the rise of the great philosophical systematists, and there is much to be done by Dr Castro's own logical acumen—and therein hides a peril. It is possible to reduce the Cervantine texts to a thesis form; it is possible to minimise the play of irony by verifying originals and deducing implications: but, in an exposition that depends on logical consistency, it is hardly possible to deal with cases of sheer inconsistency. This appears to me to arise in three matters where Dr Castro sees hypocrisy or irony: the conflict of Humanism with the doctrine of Trent, that of Spanish policy with a sympathy for the Moriscos, that of claims to moral intentions with the contents of certain novels. It is true that Cervantes praises 'hipocresía o disimulo,' but the 'hypocrisy' of his Catholicism is more logical than

ethical: Dr Castro himself remarks that it is now customary to subscribe to creeds and to accept in practice only their more rational articles. The reasons which Cervantes gives for the expulsion of the Moors are, certainly, *non-sequiturs*: yet I continue to think him a partisan of expulsion as a policy, though he may have sympathised with every individual Moor. The same position arises in the episode of the galley-slaves, where Dr Castro seems to go too far in identifying Cervantes with his hero. The principle of human sympathy with the outcast and prisoner gets beyond the bounds of logic and claims of social stability with Cervantes. Certain immoralities in the *Exemplary Novels* do not, for me, convert into irony the noble declaration of the preface. It is too much to attribute hypocrisy to him as a fundamental quality of mind: mental reservation there certainly was, and probably a number of cases in which he attempted no synthesis of conflicting principles.

The documentary biography of Cervantes, with its scandalous disclosures and devastating innuendos, has done much to erase the personal and domestic good repute of the creator of the Novel. Dr Castro's remarkable work may substitute for the biography of legal waste-paper baskets the genuine history of a consummate mind.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

GLASGOW.

The Gothic Version of the Gospels. A Study of its Style and Textual History. By G. W. S. FRIEDRICHSEN. London: H. Milford. 1926. 263 pp. 21s.

Dr Friedrichsen has given us an excellent book. It is the product of a happy combination of ripe scholarship and a rare capacity for taking pains. The arrangement of the material is no less admirable than the use made of it. Each section begins with a summary of the work already done. This is followed by the author's carefully collected material, which provides destructive criticism or ample confirmation of results obtained by his predecessors.

On the question of word-order little is said, but some examples, such as *ἐπὶ τῇ δεξιᾷ σου σιαγόνα* = *bi taihswon þeina kinnu*, prove that there are grave difficulties in accepting the view of Curme, that the language of the Gothic Bible represents good idiomatic Gothic of Wulfila's day. Since the African version also adopts Greek word-order (p. 33) we have here support for the view that the Gothic word-order is not idiomatic.

Friedrichsen's analysis of renderings shows that 'the same Greek word has been translated by the same Gothic word, wherever the sense permitted' (p. 23), thus *λεγειν* occurs 508 times, and is rendered by *qipan* 504 times. The percentage of uniformity for nouns is 81, for verbs 73 (p. 27). Where a Greek word is used in different passages with different meanings the Gothic renderings are often very skilful; thus *αγγελος* = *aggilus* (angel), but *airus* (ordinary messenger), and *σουδαριον* = *fana* (napkin), but *aurali* (face-cloth). R. Meissner's article on *cuonio uuidi*

in *Festgabe F. von Bezold*, Bonn, 1921, enables us to add *in kunawidom* and *naudibandjom* to the list of happy dual renderings on pages 41–45. A feature which distinguishes the Gothic from the Latin is that of the 64 Greek (or Hebrew) words adopted by the Latin only 28 appear in the Gothic (p. 37). Of course, there is no means of knowing how many of these words are real borrowings by the translators, i.e., had not been adopted before the translations were made. The Gothic version seems to avoid the introduction of Greek words as far as possible.

The least convincing section of the book is that devoted to 'verb-aspects' (pp. 46–68), where, following Streitberg, Friedrichsen attempts to show that the choice of renderings, e.g., *ερχεσθαι* = *qiman*, *atgagan*, *gagan*, etc., depends on 'durative,' 'effective perfective,' 'ingressive perfective,' and 'aggressive perfective' aspects, for these renderings do not always work out in accordance with the theory (p. 56). In the section devoted to the 'durative' *ειναι* = *wisan* and 'perfective' *εσεσθαι* = *wairpan* (pp. 64 f.) a comparison with the results of Lussky's investigation on *werdan* and *wesan* in the O.H.G. Tatian (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, xxiii) would have been interesting, since Lussky comes to the conclusion that the Latin text alone does not determine the use of these words.

The careful analysis of dual and multiple renderings and deviations from the norm (pp. 83–161) gives interesting results, viz. that variation is greatest in Luke, and greater in Luke and Mark together than in Matthew and John (p. 83). Luke shows an excess of 33 per cent. over Matthew and 50 per cent. over John in total variation (p. 84). This section contains a great wealth of material.

Not the least valuable result of Friedrichsen's analysis is that it puts an end to certain 'Stilgesetze,' enunciated by Kauffmann and others. To illustrate one of them only, alliteration, let us take *ασθενουντας νοσοις* = *siukans sauhtim*, and *πατηρ ημων Αβρααμ εστιν* = *atta unsar Abraham ist*. Now *νοσος* = *sauhts* eight times out of eight, and *ασθενης* = *siuks* nine times out of ten—where it is translated *unhailans* the influence of the Old Latin is clearly seen (p. 218)—thus there is here no evidence of a conscious aim at alliteration, though, of course, that does not rule out the possibility that the alliteration was felt to be pleasing. Other cases crumble up in the same way. But just when Friedrichsen's book was going to press Sievers was putting forward an even more definite 'Stilgesetz' by arranging the 'Sermon on the Mount' as 'Sagverse' (*Deutsche Sagversdichtungen des IX.–XI. Jhs.*, Heidelberg, 1924). This is not the place to check Sievers by Friedrichsen's material; it is, however, interesting to note that the rendering *τελωνι...τελωναι* *βιudo...motarjos*, which is to Friedrichsen 'a scribal blunder...The whole passage is badly copied' (p. 72), survives the delicate test of Sievers, and thus becomes, for him, the established reading (Sievers, p. 167).

Amongst 'inferior' renderings Friedrichsen includes *οζει* = *fuls ist* of John xi, 39. His objection to *fuls* is that 'it connotes rotteness in Germanic,' but he suggests that it may be after the Old Latin *putet*

(p. 127). But we ought not, perhaps, to lose sight of the special position occupied by St John from the earliest times. St Gregory speaks of his 'subtilem intelligentiam,' and St Augustine of his 'intelligentiam spiritualem.' There was, in fact, an attempt to give everything St John wrote a symbolic meaning, and it is interesting to see that St Augustine regards this passage as symbolic of sin, that the 'four days dead' means that though we are foul in our sin, yet we can rise to life with no foul smell, like Lazarus, 'neque enim Lazaro resuscitato post quatrimum ullus putor in vivente remanserat' (Migne, vol. xxxviii, col. 595). The rendering *fuls ist* may be due to the influence of some such commentary, in which case the 'exaggeration' is an excellence.

Following up the work of Burkitt, whose suggestions were so amply confirmed by the discovery of the Giessen fragment, Friedrichsen makes an exhaustive comparison between the Gothic text and the various Old Latin texts. He shows that Luke agrees with the Old Latin to a far greater extent than the other gospels. He sees that Luke ix, 43, the best test case, agrees word for word with the Old Latin f, a fact which Odefey missed (owing to overlooking *IS* as an abbreviation of *Iesus*, which accounts for the Latin *ille*). Friedrichsen's interpretation of the *Præfatio* of the Codex Brixianus, and his remarks on the nature of the *wulthres* are convincing. The result of his examination is to suggest the following descent of the Codex Argenteus: Wulfila's text descended in two channels; one shows Latin influence since 400, the other since 489. The first of these gives us Luke and Mark, Luke having been partnered by the Palatinian Latin (c. 450). Then Matthew and John, which go back to the second channel, and Luke and Mark from the first are partnered by the Brixian Latin (c. 500). There is evidence of revision after this period, and from this we have the Codex Argenteus.

A. C. DUNSTAN.

LONDON.

Die Wesensbestimmung der deutschen Romantik. Eine Einführung in die moderne Literaturwissenschaft. Von JULIUS PETERSEN. Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer. 1926. 203 pp. 6 M.

All who have been endeavouring to find a way through the vast literature that has sprung up in Germany during the last twenty years on the subject of German Romanticism will welcome Professor Petersen's critical survey of that literature. The second title of his book is, however, perhaps more important than the first; for what he has given us is essentially an introduction to the new modes of approach to literature as they are being at present explored by German scholarship. To demonstrate 'the transformation of "Literaturwissenschaft" into "Geisteswissenschaft"' Professor Petersen chooses as his field Romanticism, where admittedly its results have been most furthering and far-reaching.

However slow our Anglo-Saxon conservatism may be to adapt itself to new points of view in so fundamental a thing as the estimating of

poetic genius, we can hardly withhold our approval of the words which Professor Petersen quotes from his address—out of which the present book has developed—to the Prussian Academy of November 22, 1924:

Es liegt mir fern, die gegenwärtige Trübung der methodischen Sicherheit als Verlust einer goldenen Zeit zu beklagen; vielmehr sehe ich in den mannigfaltigen Anstürmen von seiten der Ästhetik, der Stilkunde, der allgemeinen Geistesgeschichte, der Geschichtsphilosophie, der Psychologie und der Soziologie ein erstarkendes Bewusstsein naturgegebener Zusammenhänge und ein Erwachen zu neuem Leben, das in Bereicherung der Problemstellung fortschreitende Klärung verspricht, wenn es gelingt, die widerstrebenden Richtungen zum Ausgleich zu bringen, ohne den festen Ankergrund zu verlieren.

'Die widerstrebenden Richtungen zum Ausgleich zu bringen': this, I take it, is the main purpose of Professor Petersen's work. It is an attempt to harmonise, as far as possible, the conflicting elements in present-day theories of Romanticism, and to show how these may be directed to a common end. His critical synthesis is thus clarifying and furthering, never merely negative.

The older German writers avoided—in contrast to our own literary historians, who have at no time allowed their use of the word 'Romantic' to be narrowed down to the nineteenth-century movement—the use of the word 'Romantic' until its emergence with the 'Romantische Schule' at the very end of the eighteenth century. Now, however, 'Frühromantik' and 'Vorromantik' are as familiar expressions in German criticism as 'préromantisme' is in French; and Professor Petersen's book shows how this widening of the conception of Romanticism has stimulated German criticism of the movement. He passes in review the various critical theories of our time: Nadler's geographical and racial theories, Strich's very suggestive antithesis of 'Classic' and 'Romantic,' the helpful sociological criticism of the Romantic doctrine by Kluckhohn and others, and so on. The supporters of any one theory may feel that their particular view has received less than justice at Petersen's hands; but he has done something better than merely criticise; he has coordinated. I might single out the chapter on 'Stilkunde' as a particularly enlightening section of his book. Here he pursues that line of interpretation which originated in Wölfflin's discussions of terms like Gothic and baroque, and their transference from the vocabulary of art criticism to that of literary criticism. Professor Petersen appreciates the extraordinarily suggestive value of Wölfflin's speculations for literary aesthetics; but the conclusion to which he is led is not an ever sharper and subtler discrimination—such as Strich gives us in his brilliant book—between the classic and romantic mentality; but rather: 'dass deutsche Klassik und deutsche Romantik in keinem diametralen Gegensatz stehen und dass von einer wirklichen Polarität nicht gesprochen werden kann' (p. 99). This attempted synthesis of classic and romantic, towards which I groped my way in an address to the Modern Humanities Research Association some years ago, is surely one of the most significant features of recent Romantic interpretation.

Sometimes one feels, in reading this survey, that German theorising

has become, as very often happens, too top-heavy for its empiric bases. One could wish that German scholarship, enriched by its new points of view, would hold in check for a time its sweeping metaphysical generalisations, and get to grips with the problem—not of 'Romantik' as a philosophical concept in the vocabulary of a universal 'Geisteswissenschaft'—but of what the word actually stands for within the narrow limits of the school that is known by that name. We seem to need firmer ground under our feet here. A definition of the universally 'Romantic' has, as Petersen shows, become in these days more unattainable than ever; but we are surely in a better position than we were twenty years ago, to define the Romantic phenomenon within a single literature and a single period.

J. G. ROBERTSON.

LONDON.

SHORT NOTICES

Mr B. K. Ray's short essay, *The Character of Gawain* (Dacca University Bulletin, No. xi. London: H. Milford, 1926. 13 pp. 8d.), is to be welcomed as a sign of the growing interest of the newer Indian Universities in research. There are, however, two serious dangers in premature preoccupation with research, dangers not confined to Indians, but to which they are especially liable. The first is that of undertaking research before they have acquired a sufficiently wide and deep knowledge of European languages and literatures; and the second is that of mistaking compilation for research. That many Indians in the past have made this mistake is not, perhaps, altogether surprising in a land where so many of the College libraries were so inadequately equipped, and where, at best, research in English, for lack of original authorities, can only be carried on under most serious disadvantages. (We speak from experience.) Mr Ray's well-written essay is based to a considerable extent, if we may judge from the footnotes, on the text of Malory and the Romances, although even he quotes modern English and American writers oftener than some of their opinions deserve. More frequent quotation of the Romances themselves would have made his paper on this interesting subject much more valuable as a contribution to knowledge.

S. J. C.

It is not necessary at this date to say many words about Professor Caroline F. E. Spurgeon's admirable and now well-known survey of the history of Chaucer in the mind of England (*Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion, 1357-1900*. Cambridge: University Press, 1925. 3 vols. 50s.). The great bulk of her volumes is occupied, inevitably, by the quoted allusions, for all practical purposes complete within the limits of the time stated. But this collection, invaluable as it is, by no means exhausts the importance of her book; the elaborate Introduction, which purports to record the history of Chaucer scholarship in this country, opens up larger horizons than this purpose in itself implies. Professor

Spurgeon has very fully seen that to write the history of the reputation of a man of Chaucer's calibre is in some sense to write a history of the English mind itself; and that if we understand Chaucer better to-day than the Elizabethans or the Augustans did (as we are, no doubt justifiably, convinced that we do), it is not only or altogether because we are better Chaucer scholars, and have discovered the beautiful lucidity of his 'obscure' speech, and the rhythmic melody of his 'rough-hewn' verse. In this, as in other cases of historic change, we have to reckon with two classes of phenomena, the evolution of new qualities, and the irradiating power of the 'great man.' Each of them has had its own exclusive champion—its Buckle, or its Carlyle. Miss Spurgeon points to the development in the nineteenth century of precisely the sense of humour needed for having a vivid relish for Chaucer. But her survey makes us also the more conscious of the marvel of Dryden's isolated vision of the greatness of Chaucer in 1700.

C. H. H.

In the Introduction to his edition of Spenser's *Epithalamion* (New York: F. S. Crofts, 1926), Mr Cortlandt Van Winkle outlines the history of the Epithalamium as a literary form from its Greek origin, through the classical, the early Christian, and the Renaissance Latin poets to Spenser, concluding (not much to our surprise) that his chief model was Catullus. He analyses the poem, discusses literary influences, spirit and form. His conscientious and even determined annotation displays wide research, but although he was probably right in using the Italian anthologies, his apparent restriction to the Latin collections of *Delitiae* means the omission of much important work of the Latinist schools. A more rigid division into 'sources,' 'influences' and 'parallels' would make Mr Van Winkle's work more useful and perhaps easier as well.

W. L. R.

Under the title *Gravinden af Salisbury og Marina. To dramatiske Arbejder som maa tillægges William Shakespeare* (Copenhagen: A. Busck, 1926. 95 pp.) Dr V. Østerberg has given us spirited translations into Danish of *Edward III*, I, 2; II, 1, 2, and *Pericles*, III, 1, 2, 3, 4; IV, 1, 3; V, 1, 3, with notes and an important defence of Shakespeare's authorship of these scenes of *Edward III*. The author points out verbal correspondences and, still more, correspondences of style and feeling between these scenes and *The Rape of Lucrece*, too great to be accidental. Are we then to conclude that the author of one borrowed from the other, or that both were from the same hand? The two poems are practically contemporary. The words or passages in question seem in both works the natural and spontaneous expression of the poet's mind. And—whatever critics may say—a like situation with Shakespeare often suggests a like expression. Can Shakespeare when writing *Lucrece* in 1593 or 1594 have had access to a play first printed in 1596, especially considering that from 1592 to 1594 the theatres were closed? Is it likely that another man, when writing these scenes of *Edward III*, should both use *Lucrece* and depreciate it by the remark that *Lucrece's* story had 'task'd The vain endeavour of so many pens'? At any rate Mr J. M. Robertson cannot

be right in attributing to Greene (d. 1592) scenes which imitate *Lucrece*. The most natural explanation, viz. that Shakespeare was the author in both cases, is strengthened by the many resemblances between these scenes of *Edward III* and other works such as *Romeo and Juliet*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *King John*, *Henry V*, the *Sonnets*, etc. Dr Østerberg's argument rests on many new observations, and the impression it makes cannot be indicated by any *précis*. May it not appear in an English translation? His conclusion is that these scenes of *Edward III* were written by Shakespeare soon after *Love's Labour's Lost* and *Romeo and Juliet*, and shortly before *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

G. C. M. S.

Miss E. C. Dunn's dissertation on *Ben Jonson's Art* (Northampton, Massachusetts: Smith College, 1925. xvii + 159 pp.) is a product of that rather deplorable invention, the Ph.D. It may have done her some good to write it. She has read through Jonson's work intelligently and noted many of the interactions between his masterful personality and the conditions under which he wrote. They are in the main such as any other intelligent reader could not fail to note, and Miss Dunn has not brought to bear upon them any very special quality of penetrating interpretation. Nor has she learnt to express herself. There is some pretentious writing and a good deal of slovenly writing. What is one to make of such sentences as these?

'There is perhaps no type of literature which reflects so subtly the difference of attitude and purpose in which it is undertaken than the study of types, ephemeral or eternal.' 'Theophrastus, Dekker, Addison deal with the same material but throw such varying lights upon it as to make it become almost essentially different in each case.'

Miss Dunn's pages are full of commas standing where they ought not between subject and predicate, for which she has not even Shakespeare's alleged excuse of elocutionary intention. Perhaps she too has been badly served by her printers. There is a gross misprint in the first line of the Introduction and many others follow (e.g. pp. 8, 55, 56, 86, 128, 142). Her advisers ought not to have allowed her to print the scrappy and ill-referenced biographical data of which she makes an appendix. They are the mere sweepings of a student's notebook. After misquoting Keats's sonnet on Chapman's *Homer* she writes: 'The rush of Keats's imagination was as intolerant of exactitudes as was that of some scholars of Elizabeth and James. Would that a breath of this freshness might blow through some of our modern scholarship.' She need not be afraid. It does.

E. K. C.

Professor A. H. Cruickshank has supplemented his comprehensive treatise on Massinger with an edition of one of the dramatist's best comedies, *A New Way to Pay Old Debts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. xxxiv + 141 pp. 6s.). The text follows closely the Quarto of 1633, and is preceded by an introduction which contains a well-balanced estimate of the merits and demerits of the play, and indicates the relation of its principal characters, Sir Giles Overreach and Mr Justice Greedy, to their

historical prototypes in Sir Giles Mompesson and Sir Francis Michell. The extent of this has, in the editor's opinion, been overstated. Massinger, as a member of the Cavalier opposition, was less concerned with a particular scandal than with 'the more general evils of unjust money-lending and rural oppression.' Few Caroline comedies have maintained a better hold on the stage. An appendix contains a long list of productions between 1748 and 1877, in which Kemble, Macready, Kean, Phelps, all figured, and of revivals, both in London and the provinces, during recent years. Another appendix sets out the debt of the play to Middleton's *A Trick to Catch the Old One*, which, indeed, is slight as regards verbal expression, and as regards plot does not go much beyond what the community of theme made inevitable. Professor Cruickshank calls attention to the relaxation of Massinger's blank verse. 'The metre has reached a perilous stage; it is on the down grade, and will have to be rescued for future use from complete collapse by the majesty of Milton.' This is true, but it might be added that, for the purposes of comedy, it will have to give way to prose. The editorial task is completed by a useful but rather heterogeneous collection of notes, some of which might with advantage have been relegated to a glossary.

E. K. C.

The letters contained in Dr Paget Toynbee's *Supplement to the Letters of Horace Walpole... Chronologically arranged and edited with notes and indices*. Vol. III. 1744-1797 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. 12s.) are for the most part gleanings. As a result, the collection contains a surprisingly wide range of correspondents, but the interest in their letters tends to be ephemeral. We cannot expect the same kind of self-revelation as in a long and intimate interchange. On the other hand, many personalities of note are brought within the orbit of our observation, several freaks and curiosities of society, and consequently some surprisingly variegated glimpses into the life of the times. The volume is equipped with thorough and really helpful 'Contents' and indices, and four admirably reproduced portraits.

H. V. R.

Raoul de Cambrai, translated by Jessie Crosland, forms Vol. XXVIII of *The Medieval Library* (London: Chatto and Windus. xiv + 178 pp. 5s.). It was well worth translating to represent—along with the *Chanson de Roland*, of which Mrs Crosland has already given us an English rendering—the *chansons de geste* in this series. As the translator says in her preface, *Raoul de Cambrai* is 'one of the wildest and grandest of the old French feudal epics.' Her faithful and literal translation admirably renders the diction of the original: its conventionality, but also crude realism, as, for instance, where it conveys the sense of emotions in terms of their physical accompaniments; and its characteristic texture of varying tenses and occasionally involved syntax. Attention may be called to two slips which affect the sense: 'Raoul' on p. 56 should be 'Bernier'; 'sister' on p. 113 should be 'daughter.' 'Shining' would perhaps be a better rendering than 'white' of the conventional epithet 'blanc' applied to the hauberk.

C. I. W.

Mr Ivor Arnold gives us a critical edition of the *Apparicion Maistre Jehan de Meun* of Honoré Bonet (*Publications de la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg*, fasc. xxviii. Paris: Les Belles Lettres; London: H. Milford. lxxvi + 135 pp. 7s.), which has been hitherto only available in the limited edition published by Pichon in 1845. The basis of Mr Arnold's edition is the MS. B.N. ancien fonds français, No. 811. He prints as an appendix the text of his author's *Somnium super materia scismatis*, as found in the Vatican MS. Armarum LIV, vol. XXI, fo. 73^{ro}-90^{ro}. The introduction deals with the life and works of Bonet. Without over-estimating the importance of the *Apparicion*, Mr Arnold gives a judicious appreciation of its merits and interest. In his detailed study of the language and versification of the work, by constant comparison with other Middle French authors, and careful differentiation between the meridional element due to Bonet's Provençal origin, and the constituents of the literary French of the north, Mr Arnold makes a useful contribution to our knowledge of fourteenth-century French.

C. I. W.

The little volume *Aus dem Esope der Marie de France. Eine Auswahl von dreissig Stücken*, edited by Karl Warnke (*Sammlung romanischer Übungstexte*, ix. Halle: M. Niemeyer. xii + 61 pp. 1 M. 80) forms a companion volume to the selection of *lais* published by the same editor in 1925. As a handy and inexpensive edition it should prove useful to both students and teachers who require a sample of the author's works presented in scholarly form. The collection comprises twenty-eight fables, and the editor has included both the prologue and epilogue containing the well-known lines where Marie speaks of herself and her work. The same manuscript (Brit. Mus. Harleian 978) serves as a basis for the text as that utilised in the corresponding edition of the *lais*, but the editor's method differs in the two cases; in that of the fables the main part has been printed in readable form with the necessary punctuation and resolution of abbreviations, and only the prologue presented as it is in the manuscript, whereas the reverse method was followed in the *lais*, where the main text reproduces the manuscript, and the prologue only is given in the language of the author. For practical purposes the method followed in the *Esope* seems preferable; the abbreviations may present no real difficulty to the reader, but they are tiresome impediments to a free reading of the text. A short preface precedes the text, but for a full discussion of the questions of sources, language, etc., the student must be referred to the complete edition of the fables by Professor Warnke in the *Bibliotheca Normannica*, Band VI.

J. C.

A second edition of a *Mittelhochdeutsches Übungsbuch* by Carl von Kraus (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1926. xi + 297 pp. 6 M. 50) has appeared. The aim of the book is to show the beginner what problems are encountered in the study of Middle High German literature, and to provide exercises in dealing with these problems. In the new edition *Graf Rudolf*, *Fleck's Floire*, and *Der Sperber* are omitted because investigations undertaken since the first edition appeared (1911) have rendered

these texts less suitable. In their place appear the *Mittelfränkische Reimbibel*, for which newly discovered manuscript leaves have become available, all the lyrics ascribed in the various manuscripts to Graf von Botenlauben, Markgraf von Hohenburg and Herr von Rotenburg, and *Beispielreden und Spruchgedichte* of the Stricker. For the last text Zwierzina has placed all his material at the disposal of von Kraus.

A. C. D.

In his recent book, *The Modern German Novel*, Mr Hewett-Thayer declares that the American traveller and the German-American are assuming a more prominent place in modern German fiction, but that comment is often inspired by imagination, aided only by tradition. The legend of the average American's ruthless pursuit of money, with consequent blindness to spiritual values, has attained the force of a religious dogma. Dr Paul C. Weber traces in his *America in Imaginative German Literature, 1800-1850* (*Columbia University Germanic Studies*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press; London: H. Milford. xvi + 301 pp. 12s. 6d.), the awakening interest in America during and after the War of Independence, the victory of the colonies being hailed in Europe as the dawn of a new era of political liberty. Interest declined towards the end of the eighteenth century, but reawakened with the disappointing aftermath of the wars of liberation, and though there were antipathetic voices, the general conception of America became tinged with romantic colouring. The new continent was regarded as the Promised Land and the Red Indian as a gentle savage, a view which was held until late in the century. A song by Hoffmann von Fallersleben, in which occur the following lines:

Hin nach Texas, hin nach Texas...
Dahin sehnt mein Herz sich ganz,

sounds suspiciously like a source of those modern songs which breathe a similar nostalgia for the same American state. Grillparzer was one of those who ridiculed the Rousseau-like conception of the Red Indian, and Lenau expressed his bitter disillusionment at American lack of culture. After the Romantic period, Young Germany viewed America with positive dislike. The impression gained from Dr Weber's book is that throughout the nineteenth century the picture of America reflected in German literature is inaccurate, and this confirms the finding of Mr Hewett-Thayer.

W. R.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

December, 1926–February, 1927

GENERAL.

- BALDENSPERGER, F., *La grande communion romantique de 1827: sous le signe de Walter Scott* (*Rev. de litt. comp.*, vii, 1).
- BARTOLI, M., *Introduzione alla neolinguistica*. Florence, Olschki. L. 25.
- BORGESSE, G., *Ottocento europeo*. Milan, Treves. L. 12.50.
- CLEMENT, N. H., *An Aspect of the World-Conquest Motif in Literature* (*Mod. Phil.*, xxiv, 2).
- Essays by Divers Hands, being the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature. VI. Ed. by G. K. Chesterton. London, Milford. 7s.
- FARINELLI, A., *La religion romantique et la poésie de l'infini et de l'éternel* (*Rev. de litt. comp.*, vii, 1).
- GREG, W. W., *The Calculus of Variants: an Essay on Textual Criticism*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d.
- JESPERSEN, O., *Sprogets Udvikling og Opståen* (Kultur og Videnskab, xxiii). Copenhagen, Pio. 2 kr. 25.
- LANZ, H., *The Physical Basis of Rime* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 4, Dec.).
- LOOMIS, L. M., *Arthur's Round Table* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 4, Dec.).
- MÜLLER, W., *Der schauspielerische Stil im Passionsspiel im Mittelalter*. Leipzig, H. Eichblatt. 5 M. 60.
- NEEDHAM, H. A., *Le développement de l'esthétique sociologique en France et en Angleterre au 19^e siècle* (Bibl. de la Revue de litt. comparée, xxviii). Paris, É. Champion. 40 fr.
- PALUDAN, H. A., *La fille épouse le meurtrier de son père. Remarques sur quelques 'romances' danois et espagnols*. (*Rev. fil. española*, xiii, 3.)
- RICKERT, E., *New Methods for the Study of Literature*. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press; Cambridge, University Press. 15s.
- WANN, L., *The Rôle of Confidant(e) in the Renaissance Epic* (*Anglia*, li, 1).

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

Italian.

- ARETINO, P., *Teatro*. A cura di N. Maccarone. 2 vols. Lanciano, Carabba. L. 8.
- BERTANI, C., *Sul testo e sulla cronologia delle satire di L. Ariosto*. I. (*Giorn. storico*, lviii, 3.)
- BOCCACCIO, G., *Il Decameron*. A cura di A. F. Massera. 2 vols. (Scrittori d'Italia.) Bari, Laterza. L. 60.
- BULFERETTI, D., *Storia della letteratura italiana e della estetica*. III. Dall' Alfieri al D'Annunzio. Turin, Paravia. L. 30.
- CIAN, V., *Pietro Bembo* (*Giorn. storico*, lviii, 3).
- CROCE, B., *Uomini e cose della vecchia Italia*. I, II. Bari, Laterza. L. 50.
- CROCE, B., *Il pensiero italiano nel seicento*. V. *La teoria dell' arte e la critica letteraria e artistica* (cont.). (*Critica*, xxv, 1.)
- DOSSI, C., *Opere*. IV. Milan, Treves. L. 13.
- D'OVIDIO, F., *Studi sul Petrarca e sul Tasso*. Rome, Ed. A. P. E. L. 25.

- GALLI, G., I poeti G. B. Felice Zappi e Faustina Moratti. Bologna, Cappelli. L. 10.
- HARROWER, R. B., A New Theory of Dante's Matelda. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 2s. 6d.
- LAIGNEL, M. T., La littérature italienne. Paris, A. Colin. 8 fr.
- Opuscoli e lettere di Riformatori italiani del Cinquecento. A cura di G. Paladino. II. Bari, Laterza. L. 25.
- PASSAMONTI, E., Cesare Tapparelli d'Azeglio e V. Alfieri (*Giorn stor.*, lviii, 3).
- PELLEGRINI, C., Il Sismondi e la Storia della letteratura dell' Europa meridionale. Florence, Olschki. L. 25.
- PETRARCA, F., L'Africa. Edizione critica per cura di N. Festa. Florence, Sansoni. L. 100.
- SAMMARTANO, N., Emilio De Marchi. Palermo, Sandron. L. 7.
- STARKIE, W., Luigi Pirandello. London, E. Dent. 7s. 6d.
- TASSONI, A., Opere minori. A cura di G. Nascimbeni e G. Rossi. 3 vols. Rome, Formiggini. L. 30.
- VENTO, S., La prima allegoria del Poema dantesco. Ricerche e studii. Palermo, Trimarchi. L. 6.50.
- VINCIGUERRA, M., Interpretazione del petrarchismo. Turin, Ediz. del Baretto. L. 8.

Spanish, Portuguese.

- ALONSO, A., La subagrupación románica del catalán (*Rev. fil. española*, xiii, 3).
- ATKINSON, W., The Picaresque Novel (*Bull. Span. Studies*, iv, 13, Jan.).
- BERCEO, GONZALO DE, Los Milagros de nuestra Señora. I. Herausg. von A. Hämel. (Sammlung roman. Übungstexte, x.) Halle, M. Niemeyer. 1 M. 60.
- GILLET, J. E., Perolópez Ranjel, Farça a Honor y Reverencia del glorioso Nacimiento (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 4, Dec.).
- GUILLEN DE CASTRO Y BELLVIS, La Tragedia por los celos. Ed. by H. Alpern. Paris, E. Champion. 35 fr.
- HAZARD, P., De l'ancien au nouveau monde: les origines du romantisme au Brésil (*Rev. de litt. comp.*, vii, 1, Jan.).
- PEERS, E. A., Studies in the Influence of Sir Walter Scott in Spain (*Rev. Hispanique*, lxxviii, 153).
- PEERS, E. A., Studies of the Spanish Mystics. I. London, Sheldon Press. 15s.
- SCHONS, D., Some Obscure Points in the Life of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz (*Mod. Phil.*, xxiv, 2).

Roumanian.

- JORDAN, J., Rumänische Toponomastik. II, III. (Veröffentlichungen des roman. Instituts der Univ. Bonn, v, 2.) Bonn, K. Schroeder. 8 M.
- Lettres roumaines de la fin du XVI^e et du début du XVII^e siècle tirées des Archives de Bistritza. Publiées par A. Rosetti. Bucharest, Soccece. 250 lei.

Provençal.

- JEANBOY, A., Études sur l'ancienne poésie provençale. I. (*Neuphil. Mitteilungen*, xxvii, 5, 6.)

French.

(a) General (incl. Linguistic).

- GAMILLSCHEG, E., Etymologisches Wörterbuch der französischen Sprache. Lieferung VI-VIII. (Samml. roman. Elementarbücher, iii, 3.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. Each 2 M.

HOB, F., Die Benennungen von Sichel und Sense in den Mundarten der romanischen Schweiz (Wörter und Sachen, Beihefte, v). Heidelberg, C. Winter. 6 M.

ROUMQUIÈRE, H., Le Français dans les relations diplomatiques (Univ. of California Publ. in Mod. Philology, xii, 4). Berkeley, Univ. of California Press. \$1.

(b) *Old French.*

ARMSTRONG, E. C., The Authorship of the 'Vengement Alixandre' and of the 'Venjance Alixandre' (Elliott Monographs, xix). Princeton, Princeton Univ. Press. \$1.

EDWARDS, B., A Classification of the Manuscripts of Gui de Cambrai's 'Vengement Alixandre' (Elliott Monographs, xx). Princeton, Princeton Univ. Press. 80 c.

McKEEHAN, I. P., 'Guillaume de Palerme': a Medieval Best-seller (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 4).

(c) *Modern French.*

BECQUE, H., Œuvres complètes. I-VII. Paris, Crès. 84 fr.

CHAMPION, P., Marcel Schwob et son temps. Paris, Grasset. 15 fr.

CHASE, C. B., The Young Voltaire. London, Longmans. 12s. 6d.

CRUE, F. DE, L'ami de Rousseau et des Necker. Paul Moulton à Paris en 1778. Paris, É. Champion. 12 fr.

DUCLAUX, M., Portrait of Pascal. London, E. Benn. 10s. 6d.

FLOTTE, P., La pensée politique et sociale d'Alfred de Vigny. Paris, Les Belles Lettres. 40 fr.

GONCOURT, E. et J. DE, Préfaces et manifestes littéraires. Paris, Flammarion. 10 fr.

JOHNSTONE, G. H., Prosper Mérimée: a Mask and a Face. London, G. Routledge. 10s. 6d.

KARENINE, W., George Sand. Sa vie et ses œuvres. IV. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 60 fr.

LANCASTER, H. C., Sidney, Galaut, La Calprenède: an Early Instance of the Influence of English Literature upon French (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xlii, 2).

MOREAU, P., Ferdinand Denis et les Romantiques (*Rev. d'Hist. litt.*, xxxiii, 4).

MORUET, D., La pensée française au XVIII^e siècle. Paris, A. Colin. 9 fr. 80.

PALACHE, J. G., Four Novelists of the Old Regime (Crébillon, Laclos, Diderot, Restif de la Bretonne). London, J. Cape. 12s. 6d.

RANSELOT, J., Les manifestations du déclin poétique au début du XVIII^e siècle (*Rev. d'Hist. litt.*, xxxiii, 4).

RENAN, E., Sur Corneille, Racine et Bossuet. Notes inédites. Paris, Les Cahiers de Paris. 18 fr.

REYNAUD, L., Le Romantisme. Les origines anglo-germaniques. Paris, A. Colin. 25 fr.

ROOSBROECK, G. L. VAN, 'Alzirette,' an Unpublished Parody of Voltaire's 'Alzire' (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 4).

ROYÈRE, H., Baudelaire, mystique de l'amour. Paris, É. Champion. 80 fr.

SAINT-EUVE, A., Études des Lundis. Annotées par M. Allem. XVI^e siècle. 2 vols. Paris, Garnier. 18 fr.

SALE, A. DE LA, The Fifteen Joys of Marriage. Ascribed to. Transl. by R. Aldington. (Broadway Translations.) London, G. Routledge. 7s. 6d.

SCHORR, T., Über Casimir Delavigne (Giessener Beitr. zur roman. Phil., xx). Giessen, Roman. Seminar. 3 M. 75.

- SERVAL, M., Autour d'un roman de Balzac: Le Lys dans la vallée (*suite*) (*Rev. d'Hist. litt.*, xxxiii, 4).
- SICILIANO, I., Dal Romanticismo al simbolismo. Th. de Banville. Turin, Bocca. L. 38.
- VERMALE, F., Les origines des 'Considérations sur la France' de Joseph de Maistre (*Rev. d'Hist. litt.*, xxxiii, 4).
- WILCOX, F. H., Prévost's Translations of Richardson's Novels (Univ. of California, Publ. in Modern Philology, xii, 5). Berkeley, Cal., Univ. of California Press. \$1.
- ZWEIG, S., Erinnerungen an É. Verhaeren. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 12 M.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

- KLUGE, F., Nominale Stammbildungslehre der altgermanischen Dialekte (Sammlung kurzer Gramm. germ. Dialekte, 13, 1). 3te Aufl. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 5 M.

Scandinavian.

- BENDZ, E., A. U. Bååth och hans krets. Stockholm, Geber. 4 kr.
- BJØRNSON, B., Samlede Digte. Utgit av F. Bull. 2 vols. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 15 kr.
- BLICHER, S. S., Samlede Skrifter. Udg. af J. Aakjær og G. Christensen. xvii. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 5 kr. 50.
- BRIX, H., Danmarks Digtere. Fyrretyve Kapitler af dansk Digttekunsts Historie og Billeder. Hæfte 11, 12. Copenhagen, H. Aschehoug. Each 1 kr. 50.
- BULL, F. og F. PAASCHE, Norsk Literaturhistorie. i. Oslo, Aschehoug. 16 kr.
- Edda. Die Lieder des Codex regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern. Herausg. von G. Neckel. i. 2te Aufl. (Germanische Bibl., ii, 9.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 5 M. 30.
- Fornkvædi, Norræn. Islansk Samling af folkelige Oldtidsdigte om Nordens Guder og Heroer, almindelig kaldet Sæmunder Edda hins froda. Fotomekanisk optryk. Udg. af S. Bugge. Copenhagen, H. Aschehoug. 16 kr.
- GEISMAR, E., S. Kierkegaard. Hans Livsudvikling og Forfattervirksomhed. ii. Copenhagen, Gad. 4 kr.
- GRØNBECH, V., Nordiska myter och sagor. Med kulturhistorisk indledning. (Natur och Kultur.) Copenhagen, Gad. 7 kr. 50.
- HOLBERG, L., Breve. Udg. af V. Dahlerup. Copenhagen, Gad. 18 kr.
- MARCUS, C. D., Knut Hamsun. Berlin-Grunewald, Horen-Verlag. 6 M. 50.
- STURTEVANT, A. M., Certain Old Icelandic Words with Diminutive Suffixes (*Germ. Rev.*, ii, 1).
- WERGELAND, H., Samlede Skrifter. iv. Utgit av A. Seip. Oslo, Steen. 38 kr.

Dutch.

- MEER, M. J. VAN DER, Historisch eGrammatik der niederländischen Sprache. i. (German. Bibliothek, i, xvi, 1.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 16 M.
- VOOYS, C. G. N. DE, Middelnederlandse legenden en exempelen. Vermeerderde uitgave. Groningen, J. B. Wolters. 5 fl. 90.

English.

(a) General (incl. Linguistic).

- FUNKE, O., Sprachphilosophische Probleme bei Bacon (*Engl. Studien*, lxi, 1).
- HOPWOOD, D., The Place-Names of the County of Surrey, including London in Surrey (*Annals of the Univ. of Stellenbosch*, iv, 13, 2). Capetown, Nasionale Pres. 2s. 6d.

REANEY, P. H., *The Dialect of London in the Thirteenth Century* (*Engl. Studien*, lxi, 1).

(b) *Old and Middle English.*

Book of the Ordre of Chyualry, The. Transl. and printed by W. Caxton from a French Version of Ramon Lull's 'Le Libre del Orde de Cauayleria.' Together with Adam Loutfut's Scottish Transcript. Ed. by A. T. P. Byles. (Early Engl. Text Soc., Orig. Ser., 168.) London, H. Milford. 15s.

CARGILL, O., *The Authorship of the 'Secunda Pastorum'* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 4).

CHAUCER, G., *The Nun's Priest's Tale*. Ed. by K. Sisam. Oxford, Clar. Press. 1s. 6d.

Christ and Satan. An Old English Poem. Ed. by M. D. Clubb. (Yale Studies in English, lxx.) New Haven, Conn., Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 8s. 6d.

Court of Sapience, The. Spätmittelenglische allegorisch-didaktisches Visionsgedicht. Herausg. von R. Spindler. (Beiträge zur engl. Phil., vi.) Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 10 M.

Dialogus inter Militem et Clericum; Richard Fitzralph's Sermon: Defensio Curatorum; and Methodius, The Begynnyng of the World and the Ende of Worlde, by John Trevisa. Ed. by A. J. Perry. (Early Engl. Text Soc., Orig. Ser., 167.) London, H. Milford. 25s.

FORT, M. D., *The Metres of the Brome and Chester Abraham and Isaac Plays* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 4).

MANLY, J. M., *Chaucer and the Rhetoricians* (British Academy. Warton Lecture on English Poetry, xvii). London, H. Milford. 1s.

MANLY, J. M., *Some New Light on Chaucer*. New York, H. Holt. \$3.

St Erkenwald. A Middle English Poem. Ed. by H. L. Savage. (Yale Studies in English, lxxii.) New Haven, Conn., Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 8s. 6d.

SCHLEICH, G., *Die Gloucestershire Legende der heiligen Juliane* (*Archiv f. neuere Sprachen*, cli, 1, 2).

Stanzaic Life of Christ, A. Compiled from Higden's 'Polychronicon' and the 'Legenda aurea.' Ed. from MS. Harley 3909 by F. A. Foster. (Early Engl. Text Soc., Orig. Ser., 166.) London, H. Milford. 35s.

(c) *Modern English.*

AAS, L., *Bernhard Shaw og hans verker*. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 6 kr. 50.

AUSTEN-LEIGH, J. E., *Memoirs of Jane Austen*. Ed. by R. W. Chapman. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d.

BEAUMONT, SIR JOHN, *The Theatre of Apollo (1625)*. Ed. by W. W. Greg. London, F. Etchells and H. Macdonald. 8s. 6d.

BRINKLEY, R. F., *Nathan and Nathaniel Field* (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xlii, 1).

BURNEY, FANNY, and the Burneys. Ed. by R. B. Johnson. London, Stanley Paul. 16s.

CARLELL, LODOWICK, *The Fool would be a Favourit; The Tragedy of Osmond the Great Turk (1657)*. Ed. by Allardyce Nicoll. London, Golden Cockerel Press. Each 15s.

CLARK, C., *A Study of Hamlet*. Oxford, Blackwell. 4s. 6d.

COATS, R. H., *J. Galsworthy as a Dramatic Artist*. London, Duckworth. 6s.

COWL, R. P., *Some 'Echoes' in Elizabethan Drama of Shakespeare's King Henry IV, Parts 1 and 2, in Relation to the Text of those Plays*. Hel-singfors, Frenckell; London, E. Mathews and Marrot. 2s.

- EDGAR, P., Henry James, Man and Author. London, Grant Richards. 12s. 6d.
- Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Collected by J. Buchan. xii. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d.
- EVELYN, J., Memoirs for my Grandson. Transcribed and ed. by G. Keynes. London, Nonesuch Press. 10s. 6d.
- FLETCHER, H. F., Milton's Semitic Studies, and Some Manifestations of them in his Poetry. Chicago, Chicago Univ. Press; Cambridge, Univ. Press. 15s.
- GISSING, G., Letters to Members of his Family. Ed. by A. and E. Gissing. London, Constable. 18s.
- GRAVES, K., The English Ballad. A Short Critical Survey. London, E. Benn. 6s.
- GRIEVE, C. M., Contemporary Scottish Studies. First Series. London, L. Parsons. 10s. 6d.
- HALDANE, E. S., George Eliot and her Times. A Victorian Study. London, Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.
- HAMILTON, M. A., Thomas Carlyle. London, L. Parsons. 4s. 6d.
- HARBESON, W. P., The Elizabethan Influence on the Tragedy of the Late Eighteenth and the Early Nineteenth Centuries. Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis. Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania.
- HARINGTON, SIR JOHN, The Epigrams of. Ed. with Introduction and Notes by N. E. McClure. Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis. Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania.
- HAWKINS, L. M., Gossip about Dr Johnson and Others. Being Chapters from the Memoirs of Miss Laetitia Matilda Hawkins. Ed. by F. H. Skrine. London, Nash and Grayson. 12s. 6d.
- HILLEBRAND, H. N., The Child Actors (Univ. of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, xi, 1, 2). Urbana, Univ. of Illinois Press. \$2.
- HOLLOWAY, E., Whitman: an Interpretation in Narrative. London, A. Knopf. 21s.
- HUXLEY, A., Essays New and Old. London, Chatto and Windus. 42s.
- JENTE, R., The Proverbs of Shakespeare with Early and Contemporary Parallels (Washington Univ. Studies, Humanistic Series, xiii, 2). Washington, Univ. Press.
- KREIPE, C. E., Milton's 'Samson Agonistes' (Stud. zur engl. Phil., lxx). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 3 M. 40.
- LARSON, M. A., Milton and Servetus: a Study in the Sources of Milton's Theology (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 4).
- LAW, H. A., Anglo-Irish Literature. London, Longmans. 6s.
- LEWIS, W., The Lion and the Fox. The Rôle of the Hero in the Plays of Shakespeare. London, Grant Richards. 16s.
- LYNCH, K. M., The Social Mode of Restoration Comedy (Univ. of Michigan Publ. in Lang. and Lit., iii). New York, Macmillan Co. \$2.50.
- MICHAUD, R., Le roman américain d'aujourd'hui. Paris, Boivin. 12 fr.
- NICOLL, ALLARDYCE, A History of Late Eighteenth-Century Drama, 1750-1800. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 16s.
- PAGE, JOHN, The Siege of Rouen. Herausg. von H. Huscher. (Kölner Angl. Arbeiten, i.) Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz.
- PFEIFFER, S., George Eliots Beziehungen zu Deutschland. Heidelberg, C. Winter.
- Phoenix Nest, The. Reprinted from the Original Edition of 1593. London, Etchells and Macdonald. 18s.
- Poems on Several Occasions. Written in the Eighteenth Century. Ed. by K. W. Campbell. (Percy Reprints, ix.) Oxford, B. Blackwell. 6s.

- POWER, W., *R. Burns and other Essays and Sketches*. Glasgow, Gowans and Gray. 6s.
- RANNIE, D. W., *Scenery in Shakespeare's Plays and other Studies*. Oxford, B. Blackwell. 10s. 6d.
- RAYSOR, T. M., *The Downfall of the Three Unities* (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xlii, 1, Jan.).
- RICHTER, H., W. S. Landor (*Schluss*) (*Anglia*, li, 1).
- SADLEIR, M., *Trollope: a Commentary*. London, Constable. 15s.
- SCHOELL, F. L., *Études sur l'humanisme continental en Angleterre à la fin de la Renaissance* (*Bibl. de la Rev. de litt. comp.*, xxix). Paris, É. Champion. 50 fr.
- SELINCOURT, B. DE, *Pomona, or the Future of English*. London, Kegan Paul. 2s. 6d.
- SHAKESPEARE, W., *Much Ado About Nothing*. Ed. by E. C. Abbott. (*The King's Treasury of Literature*.) London, J. M. Dent. 1s. 4d.
- SHAKESPEARE, W., *Measure for Measure*. Ed. by W. H. Durham; Titus Andronicus. Ed. by A. M. Witherspoon. (*The Yale Shakespeare*.) New Haven, Conn., Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. Each 4s. 6d.
- SHARPEAM, EDWARD, *Cupid's Whirligig, 1607*. Ed. by Allardyce Nicoll. London, The Golden Cockerel Press. 15s.
- SMITH, H. J., *O. Goldsmith's 'The Citizen of the World.' A Study*. (*Yale Studies in English*, lxxi.) New Haven, Conn., Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 8s. 6d.
- SPENCE, L., *The Influence of Marlowe's Sources on 'Tamburlaine.'* I. (*Mod. Phil.*, xxiv, 2.)
- SWIFT, J., *Gulliver's Travels. The Text of the First edition*. Ed. by H. Williams. London, First Edition Club. 42s.
- TAYLOR, C. G., *The 'Christus Redivivus' of N. Grimald and the Hegge Resurrection Plays* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 4).
- TILLEY, M. P., *Elizabethan Proverb Lore in Lyly's 'Euphues' and in Pettie's 'Petite Pallace'* (*Univ. of Michigan Publications*, ii). New York, Macmillan Co. \$3.50.
- VAN AMERONGEN, J. B., *The Actor in Dickens*. London, C. Palmer. 7s. 6d.
- VAN DAM, B. A. P., *Did Shakespeare revise 'Romeo and Juliet'?* (*Anglia*, li, 1).
- VOWINCKEL, E., *Der englische Roman der neuesten Zeit und Gegenwart*. Berlin, F. A. Herbig. 6 M. 50.
- WALPOLE, H., *A Selection of the Letters of*. Ed. by W. S. Lewis. 2 vols. London, H. Milford. 45s.
- WELBY, T. E., *A Study of Swinburne*. London, Faber and Gwyer. 16s.
- WHITMORE, C. E., *A Proposed Compromise in Metrics* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 4).

German.

(a) General (incl. Linguistic).

- BIENER, C., *Die Stellung des Verbums im Deutschen* (*Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, lxiii, 4).
- GRIMM, J. und W., *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, x, iii, 4. Bearb. von B. Crome. Leipzig, S. Hirzel. 3 M.
- HAMANN, H., *Die Überseele. Grundzüge einer Morphologie der deutschen Literaturgeschichte*. Leipzig, J. J. Weber. 3 M.
- HENZEN, W., *Die deutsche Freiburger Mundart im Sense- und südöstlichen Seebezirk* (*Beitr. zur Schweizerdeutschen Grammatik*, xvi). Frauenfeld, Huber. 10 fr.

- LEHNERT, A., Studien zur Dialektgeographie des Kreises Saarlouis. Bonn, F. Klopp. 12 M.
- MERKER, P., und W. STAMMLER, Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte, ii, 3, 4. Berlin, W. de Gruyter. Each 3 M. 50.
- MÜLLER, J., Rheinisches Wörterbuch, i, 10, 11. Bonn, F. Klopp. Each 2 M. 50.
- (b) *Old and Middle High German.*
- BAESECKE, G., Lichtdrucke nach althochdeutschen Handschriften. Herausg. von. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 12 M.
- BRAUER, H., Die Bücherei von St Gallen und das althochdeutsche Schrifttum (Hermæa, xvii). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 5 M. 60.
- DIEL, F., Reimwörterbuch zum 'Renner' des Hugo von Trimberg (Münchener Texte, Erg.-Reihe, vii). Munich, G. D. W. Callwey. 8 M.
- Eckenlied. Bruchstücke einer neuer Fassung. Herausg. von C. von Kraus. II. (Abhandl. der bayer. Akad. der Wissenschaften, Philos.-philol. Klasse, xxxii, 4.) Munich, R. Oldenbourg. 3 M.
- HACKER, F., Untersuchungen zur Weimarer Liederhandschrift (*Paul und Braunes Beitr.*, 1, 3).
- LEICHER, R., Die Totenklage in der deutschen Epik von der ältesten Zeit bis zur Nibelungen-Klage (German. Abhandl., lviii). Breslau, M. und H. Marcus. 9 M.
- SCHLAGETER, E., Heimwörterbuch zu Gottfrieds 'Tristan' (Münchener Texte, Erg.-Reihe, vi). Munich, G. D. W. Callwey. 10 M.
- SIEVERS, E., Heliand, Tatian und Hraban (*Paul und Braunes Beitr.*, 1, 3).
- SIEVERS, E., Zu Heinrich von Morungen (*Paul und Braunes Beitr.*, 1, 3).
- Trojanerkrieg, Der Göttweiger. Herausg. von A. Koppitz. (Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters, xxix.) Berlin, Weidmann. 33 M.
- WÄELZEL, K., Reimwörterbuch und Verzeichnis der Reimwörter aus 'Daniel von dem blühenden Tal' und dem 'Pfaffen Amis' von dem Stricker (Münchener Texte, Erg.-Reihe, viii). Munich, G. D. W. Callwey. 6 M.
- WEBER, E., Des deutschen Spielmanns Werden und Wirken. Munich, G. D. W. Callwey. 2 M. 50.
- (c) *Modern German.*
- ARNIM, BETTINA VON, Leben und Briefwechsel mit Goethe. Herausg. von F. Bergemann. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 9 M. 50.
- BETTELHEIM, A., K. Schönherr und das österreichische Volksstück. Vienna, A. Hartleben. 2 M. 50.
- BIANCHI, L., Der junge Josef Görres und F. Hölderlins 'Hyperion.' Heidelberg, Weiss. 1 M. 50.
- BLANKENAGEL, J. C., Wallenstein und Prinz Friedrich von Homburg (*Germ. Rev.*, ii, 1).
- BOTTACCHIARI, R., Heine (Letterature Moderne). Turin, Bocca. L. 28.
- BUSSE, K., H. Sudermann. Sein Werk und sein Wesen. Stuttgart, Cotta. 3 M. 50.
- CAMPBELL, T. M., History as Costume in Hebbel's Dramas (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xli, 8, Dec.).
- ECK, E. VON, Die Literaturkritik in den Hallischen und Deutschen Jahrbüchern (1838-42) (German. Studien, xlii). Berlin, E. Ebering. 5 M.
- ESSL, K., Über G. Kellers 'Singedicht.' Eine Untersuchung. (Prager Deutsche Studien, xl.) Reichenberg, F. Kraus. 2 M. 20.
- GERHARD, M., Der deutsche Entwicklungsroman bis zu Goethes 'Wilhelm Meister' (Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift, Buchreihe, ix). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 7 M. 50.
- GÖRTE, E., Der junge Tieck und die Aufklärung (German. Studien, xlv). Berlin, E. Ebering. 4 M.

- GOTTHELF, J., *Sämtliche Werke*. **xxi**. Herausg. von R. Hunziker und H. Bloesch. Zurich, E. Rentsch. 8 M. 50.
- GRIMM, J. und W., *Briefwechsel mit K. Lachmann*. Herausg. von A. Leitzmann. Lief. 6. Jena, Frommann. 8 M.
- HEWETT-THAYER, H. W., *Tieck and Hebbel's Tragedy of Beauty* (*Germ. Rev.*, ii, 1).
- HOWE, G. M., *Heinrich von Kleist: Lehrjahre, 1799–1801* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 4, Dec.).
- JABLONSKI, W., *Vom Sinn der Goetheschen Naturforschung*. Berlin, Reuss und Pollack. 2 M. 50.
- Jahresberichte über die wissenschaftlichen Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der neueren deutschen Literatur. Neue Folge, iv, 1924. Berlin, W. de Gruyter. 15 M.
- JOCKERS, E., *F. Werfel als religiöser Dichter* (*Germ. Rev.*, ii, 1).
- KENTENICH, G., *Die Genovefalegende: ihre Entstehung und ihr ältester datierter Text*. Trier, B. Lintz. 2 M.
- KOISCHWITZ, O., *Der Theaterherold im deutschen Schauspiel des Mittelalters und der Reformationszeit* (*German. Studien*, xlv). Berlin, E. Ebering. 4 M. 50.
- KUTSCHER, A., *F. Wedekind. Sein Leben und seine Werke*. II. Munich, G. Müller. 5 M.
- LENDI, K., *Der Dichter Pamphilus Gengenbach. Beiträge zu seinem Leben und seinen Werken*. (Sprache und Dichtung, xxxix.) Bern, F. Haupt. 2 M. 80.
- LEWALD, F., *Römisches Tagebuch, 1845–46*. Herausg. von H. Spiero. Leipzig, Klinckschardt und Biermann. 4 M. 80.
- MAHRHOLZ, W., *Deutsche Dichtung der Gegenwart. Probleme, Ergebnisse, Gestalten*. Wegweiser-Verlag.
- MAIONE, I., *Hölderlin*. Turin, Soc. ed. internazionale. L. 10.
- MOTYLEW, I., 'Verdeckte Handlung' in Hebbels Dramen (*Hebbel-Forschungen*, xvi). Berlin, B. Behr. 3 M. 25.
- NAGL, J. W. und J. ZEIDLER, *Deutsch-Österreichische Literaturgeschichte*, iii, 1. Herausg. von E. Castle. Vienna, C. Fromme. 8 M. 40.
- PRICE, L. M., *A. von Haller and English Theology* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xli, 4, Dec.).
- QUADT, M., *Die Einkleidungsform der Novellen Paul Heyses* (*Germ. Rev.*, ii, 1).
- RAS, G., *Börne und Heine als politische Schriftsteller*. Groningen, J. B. Wolters. 3 fl. 90.
- SCHIEWILLER, O., *Annette von Droste-Hülshoff in der Schweiz*. Einsiedeln, Benziger. 7 fr. 50.
- SCHMID, E. E., *Hebbel und Kleist. Zwei Kapitel zur Frage des Einflusses*. Munich, J. Hohenester. 2 M. 50.
- SPENLÉ, J. É., *Les thèmes inspireurs de la poésie de Rilke* (*Merc. de France*, Feb. 15).
- SPIERO, H., *Die Heilandsgestalt in der neueren deutschen Dichtung*. Berlin, Eckart. 6 M.
- STREICHER, S., *Spitteler und Böcklin*. I. Zürich, Orell Füssli. 5 fr.
- WAHNES, G. H., *Goethe, Minchen Herzlieb und das Frommannsche Haus*. Jena, Frommann. 4 M.
- ZEYDEL, E. H., *Early References to Storm and Stress in German Literature* (*Indiana Univ. Studies*, lxxi). Bloomington, Ind., Indiana Univ. Press. 50 c.

NOTES ON OLD AND MIDDLE ENGLISH

Exeter Book, Riddle 58 (eds. of Tupper, and Wyatt).

The riddle is probably, as Tupper says, one of the Bird-group; but his quotations from Aldhelm are unfortunate. The 'rubicundum guttur' should have made him reflect; l. 6 is nothing to the purpose. *Hirundo fulva* is not an English species, unless a synonym which we have not found; and its specific name does not sound fitting for the riddle-subject. We do not mean that the riddles can only deal with animals native to Great Britain; we suppose that some may speak of creatures known to the continental Angles, from the classical authors, or imported as pets and the like; but it is better that native species should answer the riddles. The passage from Vergil which Tupper quotes, shows that the swallow may, in poetry, be called simply 'black'; but in a riddle which is to be fairly guessable, this description needs modification, such as Gilbert White implies, and the Rhodian carol almost explicitly states. The English swallow (*Hirundo rustica* Linn.) is blue-black, steel-blue, or purple above, with chestnut and blue throat, and buffish white breast; the house-martin (*Delichon urbica* (Linn.)) is blue and white, the sand-martin (*Riparia riparia* (Linn.)) is brown and white. The swift (*Micropus apus* (Linn.)), formerly believed a swallow and called *Hirundo*, or *Cypselus*, *apus*, is chiefly blackish brown, and would be the most suitable bird of the so-called swallow kind. It builds in cliff-sides, holes of steeples and towers, eaves of sheds and cottages; its note is a harsh scream, while that of the swallow and martin is a twitter or warble. If we assume that the riddle means some English bird, and postpone the interpretation of the last line, what bird will correspond with the clues given to us? It must be black, or at least very dark, in general hue; it must be gregarious, full of outcry (MS. *rope*; of a riddle it is folly to emend the text, if the MS. can be translated); it must frequent open hill-sides, wooded headlands, and the dwellings of men. So far as we can see, only two birds fulfil these requirements—the swift and the jackdaw. The latter is black, save for its grey poll and nape; it builds in cliffs, church towers, rabbit-burrows, quarry-sides, roofs of buildings, chimneys, and hollow trees.

Let us now consider the last three words of the riddle, 'Nemnað h̃ sylfe.' Tupper says that he prefers Thorpe's rendering 'Name them

yourselves,' 'because the verb-form is the second plural imperative, and because swallows are certainly not onomatopoeic like cuckoos and bobolinks.' The verb-form may equally well be the plural indicative, and Tupper's second reason begs the question. In ordinary O.E. idiom, 'nemnað hȳ sylfe' would mean 'they name themselves,' and in no other *Exeter Book* riddle is a direct address to the audience or reader in the plural, e.g. 2, 4, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 20, 24, 27, 28, 33, 36, 37, 40, 62, 63, 67, 73, 80, 83, 86; cf. 44, 56, 60, 61, 68. If, then, it be likely that 'nemnað hȳ sylfe' means 'they name themselves,' what onomatopoeically-named creatures fit the riddle? The first line limits us, in O.E. idiom, to flying creatures, i.e., Birds, Bats, Insects. Bats are not onomatopoeic—indeed, many persons cannot hear their cries; no insect (e.g., the dor-beetle) that is onomatopoeic answers the other conditions of the riddle, without such careful fitting and forming as to make the riddle insoluble except by chance. Of birds, only the jackdaw seems to answer the riddle in all respects; for besides its habits and appearance, its voice also is like: O.E. *cēo* (M.E. *kā*) = 'jackdaw,' a name, we suppose, derived from the bird's cry.

Wyatt prefers the answer 'Gnats.' We have little evidence against this solution; our *feeling*, however, is that the solution is too modern and civilised; while, if we minutely examine the solution, gnats in a company out-of-doors (we do not speak of mosquitos in a bedroom) hardly '*hlūde cirmað*'; nor are they 'blace swiþe¹.'

Exeter Book Riddle (Tupper xvi, Wyatt xv).

The usual answer, favoured by both these editors, is 'Badger.' Let us look at a badger, and compare it with the description of the subject of the riddle. 'My neck is white': the badger's is black beneath, 'badger-grey' above². 'My head is *fealo*, also my sides'; the top and part of the sides of a badger's head are white, his sides are dark. 'I am swift in (foot-)going': the badger moves far in a night, and faster than one would think by looking only at a stuffed specimen; but swiftness is not a striking quality. 'I carry a baleful weapon': if, as it seems, the sense is vague, of any offensive (or defensive?) weapon, this trait is not peculiar to the badger. 'On (my) back stand hairs even as on (my) cheeks': the badger's cheeks are white; his back is grey. 'Two ears tower over my eyes': the badger's ears are very small, and would be quite incon-

¹ In collaboration with E. C. Llewellyn.

² Individuals doubtless vary a little; cf. Pons, *Le Thème et le Sentiment de la Nature dans la Poésie anglo-saxonne* (1925), p. 121 n.

spicuous, without their small tufts of hair; his eyes are almost lost in the dark stripe of fur in which they are set. 'I step on tiptoes (?; *ordum*) on the green grass': a badger walks like a bear, 'flat-footed,' though his front claws are long and conspicuous.

What is affirmed of the animal's habits suits the badger, upon the whole, better; but lacks the precise details of the description. What animal fits both description and habits? The fox, I think. The fox's neck is white beneath; his head and sides are *fealo*¹, if the meaning of that word be yellowish red, like some autumn leaves; he is swift; he has formidable teeth, like the badger, and a conspicuous brush which might be likened to a weapon: his ears tower conspicuously over his eyes; he steps daintily; the habits fit him fairly well, though the badger is a stronger and deeper digger;—here we must remember that the fox will use a badger's old home, and has even been found sharing a hole with him. 'Hine brēost berað' I take of the fox's belly-crawl along the burrow. The porcupine (*Hystrix cristata* L.) is not an English animal, and is, indeed, only found in the Mediterranean countries of Europe. If we are to assume that this riddle is learned and not popular, then the answer might be 'Hedgehog,' from such passages as: *Vesp. Psalter*, 103, 18: 'petra refugium irinacis' gl. 'stan zeberg izes².'

Phoenix, ll. 404 ff. (ed. Cook, 1919):

(Of Paradise lost.)

...Þær him bitter wearð
405 yrmþu æfter æte, and hyra eaferum swā
sārlic symbel, sunum and dohtrum;
wurdon tēonlice tōþas idze
āzeald æfter ȝylte; hæfdon ȝodes yrrre....

Here are two difficulties; the meaning of *tōþas idze*, and the construction of l. 408. Cook gives no help for either. Klaeber suggested (*Journ. Engl. and Germ. Phil.*, XII (1913), p. 258) that *idze* had some connexion with *icze*, *inze*, of *Beowulf*, 1107, 2577. This is possible, but does not help us much, as the meaning of neither word in *Beowulf* is known. I suggest, with diffidence, that *idze* is a corrupt or late form of the adjective *ecze*, *icce* (*Kentish Glosses on Proverbs*, v, 4, no. 87, 'gladius biceps, twiicce') and means here 'edged,' 'on edge.' Cf. *Jer.* xxi, 29, *Ezek.* xviii, 2: 'their teeth were grievously set on edge' (*Vulg.* 'dentes filiorum obstupuerunt (-escunt)') and *Cursor Mundi*, 795-6 (C): 'for of

¹ *Fealo* can hardly be applied to any of the colours at once seen when a badger is looked at. Cf. Wyld, *Essays and Studies*, Eng. Assoc., XI (1925), p. 59.

² With ll. 7 ff., 15 ff. cf. Alanus de Insulis, *Liber Parabolarum* (Migne, P.L., cxx-cxxi, 579 ff.), cap. iii: 'In ca(u)sa propria fit atrox et aspera uulpes, Quæ prius aufugeret, si foret illa foris.'

pat ilk appel bitt, pair suns tep ar eggeid yitt.' *Ā3eald* may be sb. (cf. Napier, *O.E. Glosses*, 2698, p. 73, and n. *be3ēat*); and we might then translate: 'their teeth were grievously set on edge, (that was) a repayment after guilt'; or, punctuating '...id3e; ā3eald æfter 3ylte hæfdon, 3odes yrre,' 'they had reward after sin, God's wrath.' Or it may be 3rd sing. pt. indic., and we may translate: 'he repaid them after their guilt; they had God's wrath.'

Battle of Maldon, 46-8.

Pā here3eatu is perhaps not simply 'the war-gear,' but is an ironic use of the legal term 'heriot'; this 'heriot' is the dead man's best possession, often a sword, which passes to his lord by law and custom, and which therefore commonly would, or at least could, help that lord in war. (Cf. Kemble, *Saxons in England* (1876), I, p. 178; II, pp. 98 ff.) This interpretation gives more point to 'pe ēow æt hilde ne dēah.' Similar ironic use of legal terms appears in *Beowulf*, 154-8. Irony occurs again in the unexpected words in *Judith*, 16, *wēa3esīðas*, where the listener would expect *wil3esīðas*; 19, *fæ3e*, for expected *fæ3ere* (?).

The Bestiary, 598 (ed. Hall, *Early M.E.*, 1920; I, p. 194; II, p. 622).

There is no need for any emendation. The panther is said to be 'blac so bro of qual.' A whale's brow is black; in the North Atlantic Whale (*Balaena glacialis*), the whole front of the head is so; in the Right or Greenland Whale (*Balaena mysticetus*, L.), the brow is black, contrasting with the lighter under-lip. The author had seen stranded whales, or hunted them in the North Sea.

In l. 630, Christ is said to be fair above all men, as 'euen-sterre ouer erðe fen.' If *fen* has its usual modern meaning, and *ouer* can be taken as at least partly positional, the image is vivid and beautiful, at least to one acquainted with East Anglian scenery.

Piers Plowman, A, vii, 117 = B, vi, 124 = C, ix, 129 (Skeat's text):

Tho were faitoures aferde · and feyned hem blynde,
Somme leyde here legges a-liri · as such loseles conneth,
And made her mone to Pieres · and preyde hym of grace:
'For we haue no lymes to laboure with · lorde, y-graced be 3e!'

(B; no essential differences in A or C.)

Skeat suggested that *a-liri* meant 'across, with the calf of one leg resting on the shin of the other.' In this explanation he paid due regard to the probable connexion of the word with O.E. (*spær-)**lira*, 'fleshy part, calf, of the leg'; but his interpretation of the action of the faitours hardly suits the passage. The idle and deceiving beggars pretend that

they are maimed, and therefore cannot work; the laying of one leg across the other might show their laziness, but hardly their injuries, or allow any point to the words 'as such loseles conneth.' Surely the beggars make crafty pretence of being maimed, such as the holding or strapping the calf against the back of the thigh, so that to a casual passer-by it may seem that the man has the leg cut off below the knee, or even to a more careful observer, that the muscles are shrunk so as to bring calf and thigh together in this crippling fashion. This is a well-known beggar's trick. (See Fournier and Michel, *Histoire des Hôtelleries et Cabarets*, 1851, Paris, vol. I, opp. p. 166, Plate from *La Grande Bohème*, no. 20; vol. II, opp. p. 290, Plate 31 from *La Grande Bohème*.)

Moreover, this kind of real crippling of the legs seems to have been fairly common; see *Book of the Foundation of S. Bart.'s Church* (E.E.T.S.), pp. 18, 26, 28, 35, etc. I will quote one of these cases (p. 28): 'His leggis were cleuyng to the hynder parte of his thyys / that he mighte nat goo.'

Or, *a-liri* may refer to some apparent twisting of the lower leg, so that the calf seems to be in front: see *lire* vb. = 'to plait a shirt-front,' in *E.D.D.*, where Sw. dial. *lira* = 'to twist,' and Norw. *lyra* = 'a crease, fold,' etc. are quoted. (For this deformity, see Fournier and Michel, *op. cit.*, vol. I, opp. p. 242, Plate of a beggar, after Callot.)

I suppose the phrase in the Vulgate, *Iudic.* xv, 8 (of Samson and the Philistines), 'Percussitque eos ingenti plaga, ita ut stupentes suram femori imponent,' refers to an affrighted sinking back on the knees and heels in supplication; but Petrus Comestor has a different suggestion (*Historia Scholastica*, Migne, *P.L.*, cxcviii, col. 1288), alluding to the *Septuagint*, ἐπάταξον αὐτοὺς κνήμην ἐπὶ μηρόν.

Piers Plowman, B, Prol. 123 ff.: cf. G. R. Owst, *Mod. Lang. Review*, xx, pp. 270 ff. (July 1925).

I think the passage is more simple and direct than Dr Owst would allow: i.e., that it can be solved almost entirely by internal evidence.

(a) The Angel stresses *pietas*, which regularly means 'mercy,' in Mediæval Latin.

(b) The Goliardeys, a word-master, playing with etymologies, clinging to the letter of the law, stresses *jus*, i.e., 'justice.'

(c) The people escape the difficulty of choice, by accepting the king's commands as their guides.

The contrast between 'justice' and 'mercy' was much in men's minds in the latter half of the fourteenth century: e.g., Gower's long talk

upon the question, *C.A.*, vii, 3103-4202; and his summary in *V.C.*, vi, 231, 'Lex furit et pietas dormit.'

We may compare with the people's remark: Roger Bacon, *Opus Tertium* (ed. Little, 1912, p. 58): 'Nam populus laicorum non indiget ratione ad quodlibet statutum juris; sed sufficit ei scire quod ita statutum [*v.l.* sancitum est], et quod rationes et cause omnium sufficientes habundant apud sapientes qui sciunt juris originem.' Cf. Beaumanoir's 'Ce qui plaist à faire au roi doit être tenu pour loi,' quoted by Miss Evans, *Medieval France*, p. 30.

Langland may have had in his mind Brunton and Peter de la Mare, but the Goliardeys' words are clearly neither a continuation nor a reinforcement of, but an argument against, the Angel's speech. Further, if Langland approved of de la Mare, he would hardly call him 'a goliardeys.' (Cf. Giraldus Cambrensis, *Speculum Ecclesiae*, iv, 15 (R.S. ed., iv, p. 292); his description of Goliath, 'litteratus tamen affatim, sed nec bene morigeratus, nec bonis disciplinis informatus': and Chaucer's application of the epithet to his Miller.)

The responsibility for decision, in fact, is thrown, as by Langland and Gower elsewhere, upon the king; and this is the point of the passage, and one of the main points in the poem.

I am grateful to Dr Owst for his interesting *Preaching in Mediaeval England*, but I think his special reading has misled him into making this particular application. The whole course of the argument in *Piers Plowman* seems against his theory; I admit the possibility of his suggested translation of B, Prol. 129-31, but I do not think it likely; and, in the context, any rendering of *pietas* except 'mercy' seems to me impossible.

Owl and Nightingale.

(a) 961-2 (Atkins, pp. 80, 202). I still think that the interpretation of these lines, given in *M.L.R.*, xiv (1919), is right. Professor Atkins thinks 'the construction *forlete for* is repeated in 965-6, and there *for* clearly = "for," not "because."

The construction is repeated, but the meaning of *for* in both sentences is 'because of.' Professor Atkins translates *hole brede*, 965, 'hollow log'; the words mean 'a hollow board, plank with a hole in it,' i.e., here the seat of the privy, which Shakespeare in *Ant. and Cleop.*, iv, vii, 9, called a 'bench-hole.' The argument is to be considered from 585 ff., where the owl reproaches the nightingale for singing behind the *setl* of the *rum-hus* in the thickest corner of the hedge in the house-enclosure. (In 650 ff., the owl says that she makes her

nest like a man's *bur*, with a *rum-hus* at the end of it.) Ll. 933 ff. take up this argument, and we are told that the nightingale was somewhat ashamed because the owl had reproached her with sitting and crying *bihinde þe bure*, among *þe wede*, etc. She replies: 'Thou sayst I fly behind the bower; that is true, the bower is ours; where lord and lady lie, I sit by them and sing. Thinkest thou that wise men (should) leave, because of foul mud, the right (straight) road, or that the sun should shine the less (later), because thy nest is foul? (Cf. Chaucer, *C.T.*, I, 911; Robert of Brunne, *H. Synne*, 2297 ff.) Should I, because of a board with a hole in it, leave my right place, so as not to sing by the bed, where lord hath his love beside him?' The owl's nest is merely a clever passing hit, by way of illustration: 'Shall the sun not shine, *because* your nest is foul?' i.e., what has the one thing to do with the other?

(b) 816 (Atkins' note). The poet may be drawing on Neckam, though I did not say so in *M.L.R.*, xiv (1919): I only quoted the Neckam passage as a parallel. It is probable that the fox does sometimes take refuge in a tree, as he has been known to do on roofs and in chimneys; wherever the high object is so situated that Reynard can jump on to some part of it, he may do so through fear or hunger; but he cannot ascend a bare upright tree-trunk or the like. The fox in a tree occurs elsewhere in literature, too; cf. Borrow, *R. Rye*, ch. iv. Shortly after reading Professor Atkins' note, I saw a photograph, in a daily paper, of a treed fox; I know that photographs may be faked; but I see no reason for such a fake.

(c) Atkins' ed., p. lxxxiv and l. 80. An 'awl' is not crooked; *owel* = a hook or instrument with hooked projections. W. A. Craigie, in *Trans. Philol. Soc.*, 1906, pointed out the confusions between *awel*, *owel*, on the one hand, and 'awl' on the other, perhaps owing to the N.E. form seeming to be < *āwel*, though its meaning is < O.E. *ǣl*. The word *oule*, etc., is frequent in, e.g., the *South English Legendary* in the sense of 'hook,' 'barbed implement,' etc., much used by devils; and its claw-like hooks may be seen in many a mediæval MS. picture. The *Ancren Riwe* and the *Debate of the Body and Soul* both place *oules* in the devils' hands. Chaucer's cook bears one, in the Ellesmere MS. picture: cf. Chaucer, *C.T.*, D, 1730 (*Somnour's Tale*), where Skeat's n. is wrong: 'Ful hard it is with fleshhook or with *oules* To been y-clawed, or to breme or bake' (in hell). In O.E., *āwel* glosses *fuscina*, *fuscinula*, *fuscinicula*, *uncus*, *tridens*, *angula*, *arpago*: while *ǣl* glosses *subula*. Hall explains *āwel* in *Ancren Riwe* rightly (*Early Middle English* (1920), II, pp. 384-5). The confusion between *āwel* and *ǣl* has been confirmed and continued

by the *N.E.D.*, s.v. *Awl*, but careful reading of its examples, of those in Bosworth-Toller, and in Craigie, *l.c.*, will make the matter plain.

Chaucer, C.T., B, 782 ff. (Man of Lawes Tale).

When Chaucer calls Donegild, or her spirit, 'feendly...for I dar wel telle, Though thou heer walke, thy spirit is in helle!', I do not know if it has been remarked that he may have had in mind Dante, *Inferno*, xxxiii, 121 ff. Dante says that it is a privilege of Ptolomea, wherein are those who betray friends or *guests*, to hold the spirit of the traitor, while the body walks the earth in the semblance of common life, inhabited by a demon. That Chaucer knew this notion of Dante, is clear from *C.T.*, D, 1504 ff. (*Freres Tale*); Cary notes this passage, in the commentary accompanying his translation of the *Inferno*, *l.c.* Cf. also Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus Miraculorum* (ed. Strange, 1851, II, 317), XII, 3, 4.

CYRIL BRETT.

CARDIFF.

STAGE DUELLING IN THE ELIZABETHAN THEATRE

THE consuming passion of the Elizabethans for spectacles of prize-fighting, fencing, bear-baiting, and combats of various sorts is familiar to all students of the period. So great was the love of combat that stage plays met the demand for spectacles of this sort by furnishing elaborate duels and fencing scenes. Advantage was taken of serious crises in the action of plays to make these encounters spectacles well worth watching for their own sakes. Indeed, one fact that is not sufficiently emphasised in discussions of the Elizabethan taste for dramas of blood is the fact that these dramas furnished exciting duels for which contemporary spectators had an inordinate fondness. [If a play could furnish a skilful fencing match or a prize-fight, that play was certain of one scene which would please the majority.] Combats, frequently exaggerated out of all proportion to the necessity of the action, served a dual purpose of furnishing a scene of vaudeville to please the multitude and of furthering the action of the play at the same time. It is the purpose here to point out uses of stage combats to furnish duelling spectacles in the course of play performances on the Elizabethan stage.

Elizabethan stage fencing demanded skilled swordsmen, and players prided themselves on their technique¹. The stages of the theatres were used at times for fencing matches; Chambers cites an instance at the Swan which resulted fatally². Stage duels were fought with great earnestness, and playgoers judged the contests critically. Actors were among the most earnest devotees of fencing. With them skill in fencing was both a professional asset and a matter of personal pride. A celebrated fencing school was conducted in the Blackfriars by Rocco Bonetti, the famous Italian fencing master, and his successors, Ieronimo and Vincenzo. Rocco leased the school from John Lyly in 1584³; it was there that Shakespeare is believed to have learned the art of fencing; at any rate, other actors of the period learned swordsmanship in this school, and Rocco's fencing jargon is frequently found in the plays of

¹ T. S. Graves, 'The Stage Sword and Dagger,' *South Atlantic Quarterly*, xx (1921), pp. 201-12.

² E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, Oxford, 1923, II, p. 413.

³ C. W. Wallace, *The Evolution of the English Drama up to Shakespeare*, Berlin, 1912, pp. 187-8.

contemporary dramatists; Shakespeare is supposed to refer to him in *Romeo and Juliet* in speaking of a 'very butcher of a silk button'.¹

'Skill of weapon' is mentioned as one of the characteristics of an actor by John de la Casa in his *Rich Cabinet Furnished with Varietie of Descriptions*². Players seem to have been lovers of swords. 'Speaking of three foils, one of the actors in Middleton's *A Faire Quarrel* says³: 'There's three sorts of men that would thank you for 'em, either cutlers, fencers, or players.' In discussing the coming of the actors, Hamlet says that the one who plays the part of the adventurous knight shall 'use his foil and target'.⁴ Players lost few opportunities of displaying their swordsmanship.

The playhouses when not being used for stage plays were frequently given over to exhibitions of fencing and other feats of skill or agility. In discussing the prevalence of such performances, Ordish calls attention to the fact that this use of the theatres helped to increase the demand for similar displays in regular stage plays⁵. The Red Bull was noted as a place for the playing of prizes, and both it and the Fortune were often let to prize-fighters, tumblers, rope-dancers, etc., especially during Lent⁶. Henslowe records in his diary that 'Jemes cranwigge' had played a challenge in his house and he should have had twenty shillings for it⁷. Greg supposes that Cranwigge was probably a fencer or tumbler. An extract from Dekker's prose tract, *A Knights Coniuring*, indicates that fencers used playhouses when the actors were present, perhaps between the acts of plays. He says of the devil⁸:

At sword and buckler, little Davy was nobody to him, and as for rapier and dagger, the Germane may be his journeyman. Mary, the question is, in which of the playhouses he would have performed his prize, if it had growne to blowes, and whether the money being gathered, hee would haue cozende the fencers or the fencers him, because Hell beeing under euerie one of their stages, the players (if they had owed him a spight) might with a fake trap-dore haue slipt him down, and there haue kept him as a laughing stock to all their yawning spectators.

This passage at least indicates that the fencing devil would have had a choice of playhouses.

¹ Fencing jargon, for example, occurs in *Every Man in His Humour*, Act iv, Sc. v. Matthew practises fencing; Bobadil explains the terms and boasts of his skill: 'I would teach these nineteen the special rules, as your punto, your reverso, your stoccato, your imbroccato, your passado, your montano; till they could all play very near, or altogether as well as myself,' etc. Cf. also a passage in Dekker's *Wonder of a Kingdome*, Act i, Sc. i, in which Vanni boasts of his skill and enumerates various fencing terms.

² W. C. Hazlitt, *The English Drama and Stage*, Roxburghe Library, London, 1869, p. 230.

³ Act ii, Sc. ii.

⁴ Act ii, Sc. ii.

⁵ T. F. Ordish, *Early London Theatres*, London, 1899, pp. 48-9.

⁶ J. Q. Adams, *Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*. Cornell University Studies, New Haven, 1917, p. 48.

⁷ W. W. Greg, *Henslowe's Diary*, London, 1904, i, p. 98.

⁸ T. Dekker, *A Knights Coniuring*, Percy Society, vol. v, p. 16.

Dramatists must have realised that many spectators came to see displays of fencing and thrilling fights regardless of any consideration for dramatic structure. Many expressions of resentment at the tyranny of public taste may be found in contemporary plays; dramatists sometimes warned audiences that they need not expect the usual fare of stage fights and clown play. Such an expression is given by the prologue to *Hannibal and Scipio*:

Nor need you Ladies feare the horrid sight:
And the more horrid noise of target fight
By the blue-coated Stage-keepers.

The author or authors of *Henry VIII* likewise give notice in the prologue that foolery and fighting will be absent from the performance:

.....Only they
That come to hear a merry bawdy play,
A noise of targets, or to see a fellow
In a long motley coat guarded with yellow
Will be deceived;.....

Jibes at the crude taste of early theatre-goers who sought target fights, jigs, and clownery, followed by a promise of just such target fights, occur in the prologue to Davenant's *The Unfortunate Lovers* (1638):

Good easy judging souls, with what delight
They would expect a jig, or target fight,
A furious tale of Troy, which they ne'er thought
Was weakly written, so 'twere strongly fought.

Elizabethan stage plays had a long established precedent for the insertion of combats. Contests of strength and skill furnished much of the dramatic interest in the Robin Hood plays. In the fragment of *Robin Hood and the Knight*, containing only forty lines, there are five distinct contests: a shooting match, a stone throwing match, a wrestling match, a fight in which Robin kills the Knight, and a battle with the Sheriff's men¹. The play is merely a framework for the contests. In the religious drama and later plays, more or less extraneous contests were brought in, and the accentuation of combats naturally occurring fed the popular appetite for such spectacles.

The wrestling match between Trowle and the shepherds in the Chester mystery play, *The Adoration of the Shepherds*, was considerably emphasised². The encounter between Jacob and the angel in the Towneley *Jacob* was an actual wrestling match³. The morality, *The Trial of Treasure*, presents a similar wrestling match between Just and Lust⁴. A regular

¹ J. M. Manly, *Specimens of Pre-Shakespearean Drama*, Boston, 1897, I, pp. 279-81.

² Lines 237-40.

³ Line 84.

⁴ J. S. Farmer, *Six Anonymous Plays*, 3rd series, London, 1906, pp. 209-10.

boxing match occurs in *Horestes* between the non-essential low characters, Haultersycke and Hempstringe, who are directed to 'fyght at bofites with fystes¹.' The same play has a battle scene which is exaggerated for the sake of the spectacle it affords; the direction specifies that the 'army' engaged in the battle must 'let it be longe, eare you can win ye Citie'; later the combatants are directed to 'Stryke vp your drum and fyght a good whil².'

Thus before the regular drama of the Elizabethan period had developed, plays were establishing a taste for contests of strength and skill of weapon in dramatic performances which was to result in the elaborate duels on the full-grown Elizabethan stage.

An illustration of the use of duels to provide sensational matter in blood drama is furnished by *Jeronimo*. The fights which occur near the end of the last act are earnestly fought duels. In the first duel, the contestants, Andrea and Balthezar, enter at opposite doors and call attention to their swordsmanship:

Bal. I'll top thy head for that ambitious word.

And. You cannot, prince: see a revengeful sword
Waves o'er my head.

Bal. Another over mine;
Let them both meet, in crimson tinctures shine.

(*They fight; and Andrea hath Balthezar down.*)

The 'Portogals' enter, relieve Balthezar, and kill Andrea. Immediately following, another duel takes place between Balthezar and Horatio, with Jeronimo watching and applauding his son. The stage directions are: 'They fight, and breathe afresh.' In the intermission, the duellists comment on the fight:

Bal. So young and valorous! This arm ne'er met
So strong a courage in so green a set.

Hor. If thou be'st valiant, cease these idle words,
And let revenge hang on our glittering swords,
With this proud prince, the haughty Balthezar.

(*Horatio has Prince Balthezar down; then enter
Lorenzo and seizes his weapons.*)

The duel between Mathias and Lodowick in Act II, Sc. ii of *The Jew of Malta* was prolonged, thus giving them a chance to display their swordsmanship, as the words of Barabas, who watches from a balcony, indicate:

Bar. O! bravely fought; and yet not thrust home.
Now, Lodowick! now, Mathias! So — (*Both fall*).
So now they have showed themselves to be tall fellows.

¹ Lines 286-8.

² Lines 725-68.

Greene's plays furnish several well-staged duels. The duel between Lambert and Serlsby in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, Act iv, Sc. iii, is fought with rapiers and daggers. After a few preliminaries, Lambert says: 'But draw thy rapier, for we'll have a bout.' Their sons, who are watching the fight, comment:

First Schol. Ah, well thrust.

Second Schol. But mark the ward.

(*Lambert and Serlsby fight and stab each other.*)

Orlando Furioso is larded with duels. So great is the emphasis on extraneous spectacle in this play that Greg believes that the version preserved is one designed to appeal to provincial audiences¹. At every opportunity, Orlando pleases the spectators by his ability in swordsmanship. In Act III, Sc. ii, he kills Brandimart after a sword fight; in Act v, Sc. i, he vanquishes the mighty Sacripant in single combat; but the climax of Orlando's duelling comes in his encounters with members of the Twelve Peers of France who are seeking to avenge his wrongs. Hearing Oliver call Angelica 'strumpet,' Orlando challenges him and all the others. Turpin suggests to Oliver that they 'chastise the groom':

Orl. Hear you, sir? You that so peremptorily bade him fight,

Prepare your weapons, for your turn is next:

'Tis not one champion can discourage me.

Come, are ye ready?

(*He fights first with one, and then with the other, and overcomes them both.*)

Ogier, seeing the discomfiture of his colleagues, challenges Orlando:

Og. Sirrah, prepare you:

For angry Nemesis sits on my sword to be revenged.

(*They fight a good while and then breathe.*)

Ogier exclaims that his opponent is either Orlando or the devil, and Orlando reveals his identity.

A series of quarterstaff fights varies the usual offering of sword fights in *George a Greene, the Pinner of Wakefield*. George fights at every provocation; a good part of the last portion of the play consists in these bouts in which Robin Hood and the Shoemaker of Bradford play a conspicuous part. The effect in this play is that of a series of separate encounters rather than any dramatic climax. So greedy were Elizabethans for feats of strength or skill on the stage that no incongruity was felt when the author of *Nobody and Somebody* inserted a wrestling match between persons of high birth to settle a serious dispute². Better

¹ W. W. Greg, *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements: The Battle of Alcazar and Orlando Furioso*, Oxford, 1923, p. 294.

² Richard Simpson, *The School of Shakespeare*, New York, 1878, I, p. 336. The contest is between Peridure and Vigenius.

motivation, however, is the only difference between this wrestling match and the encounter between Charles and Orlando in *As You Like It*¹. Both were trials of strength and elaborate spectacles designed to please for their own sakes.

Thomas Heywood, always ready to outdo his contemporaries in variety-show entertainment, improves on the usual stage fight by letting a pike-tossing exhibition follow one duel and precede several others in *Four Prentices of London*. The first fight comes fairly early in the play between Charles and Godfrey. Hard on this combat, the other pair of brothers, Guy and Eustace, prepare for a duel with rapier and pike. Before fighting, they toss their pikes and comment on the various exercises through which they go²:

Eust. Thou wouldst instruct thy master at this play.
Think'st thou this Rye-strew can ore-rule my arme?
Thus do I beare him when I vse to march:
Thus can I fling him up, and catch him thus:
Then thus, to try the sinewes of my arme.

(*They toss their pikes.*)

Guy. But thou should'st charge him thus, advance him thus,
Thus should'st thou take him, when thou seest from farre
The violent horses runne to breake our ranks.

Eust. All that is nothing, I can toss him thus.

Guy. I thus: tis easier sport then the Baloone.

Eust. We trifle time, this shall thy rage withstand.

Guy. With this, our Hoast shall peirce thy Soueraignes Land.

(*They fight. Robert and Palatine cast their Warders
betweene them, and part them.*)

In the course of this play there are seven single combats, all of which furnish extraneous spectacle. The pike-tossing scene evidently was famous in its day, for the Citizen in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* advises the Boy to 'read the Play of the *Four Prentices of London*, where they toss their Pikes so³.' Later Webster uses pike-tossing in *The White Devil* in a scene in which young Giovanni gives an exhibition of his manly prowess⁴.

Not all exhibitions of fencing that delighted Elizabethan audiences were so patently inserted for entertainment as were the combats in the *Four Prentices of London*. Some fights were perfectly motivated yet served a purpose of furnishing a spectacle as well. Such a fight is that between Mercutio and Tybalt in *Romeo and Juliet*, for which Mercutio had earlier prepared the spectators by describing Tybalt's skill as a fencer⁵. Without doubt, the fight between Hotspur and the Prince in

¹ Act I, Sc. ii.

² Thomas Heywood, *Dramatic Works*, London, 1874, II, p. 203.

³ Act IV, Sc. i.

⁴ Act II, Sc. i.

⁵ The fight occurs in Act III, Sc. i; Mercutio's remarks, Act II, Sc. iv.

I Henry IV was a thrilling spectacle¹. The sword fight between Montsurry and Bussy D'Ambois in *Bussy D'Ambois* was spirited². It is significant that Shakespeare makes the dénouement in *Hamlet* a fencing match with rapier and dagger³. As part of the means of expanding the fourth act of *Troilus and Cressida* a duel is staged between Hector and Ajax⁴. The fight between Marcius (later called Coriolanus) and Aufidius in *Coriolanus* is a spectacle contributing little to the play except characterisation⁵. Shakespeare and his contemporaries made capital of combats whenever possible.

Jonson, usually scornful of popular demands, departs from his avowed practice of carefully constructing his plays in *The Case Is Altered* and furnishes an extraneous bout with cudgels between Martino and Onion in Act II, Sc. iv. The opening direction is, '*Mart. and Onion play a bout at cudgels,*' and Onion exclaims:

Ha! well play'd, fall over to my leg now: so, to your guard again; excellent! to my head now; make home your blow; spare not me, make it home, good, good again! (*Mart. breaks his head.*)

This contest seems to have been inserted purely for the sake of the spectacle it afforded.

In place of the usual quarterstaff fight in plays where Robin Hood and his men participate in the action, there is a duel with swords between John and Scathlock in *The Downfall of Robert Earl of Huntingdon*⁶. The fight is long drawn out in order to give an exhibition of fencing. Probably the actors who took the parts of the two contestants were skilled in sword fencing and not in quarterstaff bouts.

The stage directions in *Look About You* indicate that the fight between Richard and Gloster is drawn out for the sake of the spectacle⁷. The first direction is, '*Fight and part once or twice*'; four lines later is, '*Fight again and breathe*'; and the last direction in the episode is, '*They breathe, offer again.*' The combat takes up two pages in the text of the play and seems exaggerated beyond any dramatic necessity.

Heywood provides for two spectacular duels between Brutus and the ravisher to close *The Rape of Lucrece* with the proper flourish demanded by an audience at the Red Bull, where the play was first produced. The first fight is with sword and target, '*Alarum, a fierce fight with sword and target, then after a pause and breathe.*' After the antagonists make their boasts again, this direction follows: '*Alarum, fight with single swords,*

¹ Act v, Sc. iv.

² Act v, Sc. ii.

³ Act I, Sc. viii.

⁷ Sc. xxix.

² Act v, Sc. iv.

⁴ Act iv, Sc. v.

⁵ Act v, Sc. i.

and being deadly wounded and painting for breth, making a strook at each together with their ganilets they fall.' If the action of the play demanded such a fight, there could be certainly no use in fighting two duels with two sorts of weapons.

An orgy of fighting beyond all dramatic needs occurs in *The Tryall of Chevalry*; the last two acts are little more than a series of combats. Act v contains seven stage directions for fights, single combats and general engagements, and nine 'alarums.' No wonder some dramatists complained about the craving for noise and target fighting. The fight between Syphax and Massinissa in Marston's *Sophonisba* is an elaborate spectacle accompanied by noise of cornets and clash of arms from the surrounding attendants¹. In *The Dumb Knight*, Act I, Sc. i, an elaborate tournament is held on the stage. The directions indicate the type of spectacle:

The cornets sound; and enter at one end of the stage a Herald, two Pages, one with pole-axes, the other with hand axes, the Duke of Epire and Alphonso, the combatants, etc. Similar directions are given for the entrance of the opponents, the King of Cyprus and Philocles; they stage a long drawn out combat, the chief purpose of which is merely that of show. A similar tournament occurs near the end of the play². Chapman makes great capital of the climactic duel between Clermont and Montsurry in *The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois*. These contestants too must breathe awhile and fight again³. Elizabethans demanded such realistic fights that the playwrights had to make shifts to let their actors have breathing spells between blows.

Acknowledgment of the skill of an actor at fencing occurs in the course of a stage fight in *A Woman Is a Weathercock*. Captain Pouts remarks to Strange, his opponent⁴:

'Zoons! can you ward so well? I think you are
One of the noble science of defence.

A similar statement of an actor's skill at fencing occurs in a spectacular fencing match between Moll and Laxton in *The Roaring Girl*. During the fight, Laxton exclaims: 'Heart, I think I fight with a familiar, or the ghost of a fencer⁵.' Stage fencing beyond dramatic necessity occurs in Webster's *White Devil*, Act iv, Sc. v, where the plot to kill Brachiano by means of a poisoned helmet comes to a climax in a fight. The directions are: '*Charges and shouts. They fight at barriers, first single pairs,*

¹ Act v, Sc. ii.

² Act v, Sc. i.

³ Act v, Sc. v. There are two interruptions in the fight to give the actors a breathing spell. In the first, Montsurry asks for time to get his 'breath a while,' and in the second, other players interrupt the fight.

⁴ Act iv, Sc. ii.

⁵ Act III, Sc. i.

then three to three.' All of this fighting is brought into the play merely to give Brachiano an opportunity to clap on a poisoned helmet! The fighting between Palamon and Arcite in *Two Noble Kinsmen* seems to have been exaggerated to give the players a chance to show their skill¹.

Comment by actors to call attention to skilful fencing in the course of a stage duel was fairly frequent. In *A Faire Quarrel* the fight between the Colonel and Captain Ager is made a regular fencing match which their friends watch and comment upon their technique²:

First Fr. of Cap. An absolute punto, hey?

Sec. Fr. of Cap. 'Twas a passado, sir.

.....

Sec. Fr. of Cap. That's a punto, etc.

Similar comment by actor-spectators occurs in the thoroughly essential duel in Massinger's *Unnatural Combat*, but even this fight was not overlooked as an opportunity for spectacle³. Not only was fencing the accomplishment of every gentleman of the period, but actual duelling was a popular fashion of the day, so much so that Fletcher satirises it in *The Little French Lawyer*, especially in the duel scene⁴. Playwrights took care that actors might not slight the combat scenes, by providing significant stage directions, as in Webster's *The Devil's Law Case* where the direction is, '*The combat continued to a good length, when enter Leonora and the Capuchin*'⁵.

University plays, as well as plays designed for the public stages, made use of variety entertainments. Fencing is one of the attractions in *Fuimus Troes: The True Trojans*, produced at Oxford in 1625; a fencing match precedes a stage duel in Act III, Sc. vii. The directions for the fencing match are: '*Androgeus and Tenantius play at foils, then Hirildas and Eulinus play.*' After fencing with foils, they take swords and fight.

The chief interest of the play in *Dicke of Devonshire* centres in the skill of weapon displayed by Dick Pike, about whose fencing the action of the play is built. In Act II, Sc. iv, Pike fights a duel with Don John and disarms him. The closing scene of Act IV ends with a series of bouts between him and Spaniards whom a Spanish judge has sentenced him to fight, one by one. When asked if he dare fight, Pike replies:

.....can a prisoner

Glory in playing the Fencer?

.....

Ile try if I have strength in this chayned arme

To breake a rapier.

¹ Act III, Sc. vi.

² Act III, Sc. i.

⁴ Act II, Sc. i.

³ Act II, Sc. i.

⁵ Act V, Sc. vi.

From the context it seems that the hero first fights with a pike against the Spaniards armed with rapiers, for when permitted his choice of weapons after the first combat, he says: 'A Quarterstaffe,—this, were the head off.' The head is knocked off, and Pike fights three men with his quarterstaff, killing one and disarming the others. One of the Spaniards exclaims: 'Hell take thy Quarterstaffe!' Pike is honoured by the Spanish duke for his fine display, and the scene, obviously one of sheer spectacle, ends.

The fencing lesson was sometimes used as a pretext for offering spectacles of swordsmanship in stage plays. Such an example occurs in Shirley's *Love's Cruelty*. Act II begins with a fencing match between Hippolito and his fencing instructor. There seems to be no dramatic reason for the exhibition, not even that of characterisation, as it serves to advance the play in no way. The scene opens in Hippolito's lodgings with the entry of Hippolito and a fencer:

Hip. Come on, sir. (*Practises with his sword.*)

Fen. Pretty well, I protest, la, keep your guard now, sir.

Hip. What do you think on't? I shall never hit your subtle body.

(*Makes a thrust at him.*)

Fen. A very dexterous proffer; bring it home; ever while you live, bring your weapon home.

Hip. Again, sir.

Fen. But you do not hit me the neat school-way; I won't give a rush to be killed out of the school-way; you must falsify thus. (*They fence.*)

Hip. How now, man?

Fen. Pretty well, let us breathe.

Shirley is fond of stage fights; in a later play, *The Imposture*, he makes a fake duel, really a fencing match, the machinery by which Volterino and Hortensio seek to discover which one Florelia loves¹. As vital to the play as the duel scene is in Act IV, Sc. iii of *The Cardinal*, it is over-emphasised for the sake of the exhibition of fencing.

The popularity of Heywood's *Age* plays, particularly of *The Iron Age*, depended in part on their appeal to the Red Bull audiences' love of spectacular fights. *The Iron Age* is a series of fights among the Greek and Trojan heroes that must have been responsible for Davenant's jibe at target fights in a 'furious tale of Troy².' One stage direction from the battle between Hector and Ajax is sufficient to show why the rowdy audiences of the Red Bull liked dramatised classical story³:

Alarum, in this combate both having lost their swords and Shields. Hector takes vp a great peece of a Rocke, and casts at Ajax; who teares a young Tree vp by the rootes, and assailes Hector, at which they are parted by both armes.

¹ Act IV, Sc. iii.

² Prologue to *The Unfortunate Lovers*.

³ Pt I, Act II, Sc. i.

Sometimes dramatists were put to strange shifts to explain away skilful fencing matches demanded by the spectators when such exhibitions of skill were distinctly out of character. In Fletcher's *The Elder Brother*, Charles, the scholarly brother, is supposed to know no sword-craft, yet he engages in a duel with his younger brother, a skilled swordsman, and wins. Fletcher makes Eustace, the younger, explain that Charles had learned to fence 'from the book'.¹

Attention has already been called to the frank confession of Davenant that the fencing match in Act iv, Sc. i of *The Unfortunate Lovers* (1638) is a concession to popular taste. The fight takes place between Galleoto and Altophiel and is so long drawn out that five interruptions are necessary to allow the fencers to get their breath². A similar duel occurs in Suckling's *The Goblins*. The play opens with a lively scene of fighting between Samorat and Philatel. There are several pauses; one direction says: '*Fight again; Samorat takes away Philatel's sword, and takes breath, then gives it him.*' This fighting, and other amusements provided, are mentioned in the epilogue as necessary to please all the spectators. A duel very much like the one in *The Goblins* is employed by Suckling in Act v, Sc. i of *Brennoralt*. Other examples of this type of stage fight might be cited³, but the fact that dramatists took advantage of plot situations to furnish spectacular entertainment is unquestionable and needs no further evidence.

(By emphasising scenes of fencing, the players had an opportunity of turning to account their skill as fencers and of displaying a technique of which they were often vain. The theatre-goers throughout the Elizabethan period greedily demanded physical contests of strength and skill. With both players and public eager for stage contests, dramatists could not omit such spectacles, even though in many cases the exhibitions were extraneous, or, at best, much over-emphasised. Thus theatrical demands were responsible for a type of variety-show entertainment which strains or violates the principles of dramatic structure. \

LOUIS B. WRIGHT.

CHAPEL HILL, NORTH CAROLINA, U.S.A.

¹ Act v, Sc. i.

² Stage directions show that the fight was expanded for effect: '*They fight awhile and part,*'—'*Fight again and sever,*' etc. Between fights, the two fencers call attention to their skill and also mention their scanty breath that requires the brief rest periods.

³ E.g. the duel in Act II, Sc. i of *Fortune by Land and Sea*, and the fight in Act II, Sc. i of *The Custom of the Country*. One scene in Brome's *The Antipodes*, Act IV, Sc. v, has in it a boxing bout between two courtiers, one of whom receives a 'Box o' th' eare,' precipitating a fight in which the stage direction is, '*They buffet.*'

PROBLEMS OF FRENCH WORD-FORMATION

ONE of the least satisfactory chapters of Darmesteter's famous work¹ is that entitled 'Verbes composés d'un Substantif Régime et d'un Verbe —Type: *maintenir*,' that is to say, compounds formed of a substantive plus a verb in which the substantive exercises ostensibly some instrumental or other quasi-adverbial function modifying the verb: thus *saupoudrer*, 'poudrer avec du sel,' *vermoulu*, 'moulu par les vers,' O.F. *fervestu*, 'vêtu de fer.' This method of formation, familiar enough in Latin (*manumittere*, *auroclavatus*, etc.), might be expected to survive in a fossilised state in certain French words, just as a fossilised genitive has survived in the names of the days of the week and elsewhere, but a statement that a method so foreign to the spirit of modern French remains creative as late as the fifteenth, sixteenth and even seventeenth centuries causes some astonishment and calls for scrutiny.

The point that this method of formation is foreign to French as we know it need not be laboured. It is impossible to form a modern French compound on the pattern of English *wind-swept* or *flea-bitten*. Even in English, the process is not without its restrictions; it would seem confined, in the main², to the formation of adjectives, which later may throw off a verb: thus *hen-pecked* begets to *hen-peck*, *man-handled* probably to *man-handle*, etc. Darmesteter, whose logic and 'science' are wholly admirable, but who is at times a little lacking in intuition, is undisturbed at discovering this method of formation as a creative force in the Middle French and Renaissance periods, and Nyrop³ accepts his findings without criticism. Brunot, discussing the Middle French vocabulary, does, indeed, express some astonishment at such a strange survival⁴, but his wonder is apparently unmingled with doubt. It appears worth our while, therefore, to give a closer scrutiny to the words which are alleged to spring from this source of word-production, especially to those of more recent birth, and to enquire whether, in some

¹ *Traité de la Formation des Mots Composés dans la Langue Française*, 2nd edition, 1894, pp. 161-7.

² Perhaps exclusively; the matter is worth investigating.

³ *Grammaire Historique de la Langue Française*, III, pp. 268-9.

⁴ 'Sur les vieux types cloufichier, *fervestir*, on forme *saupiquier*, d'où *saupiquet*, *colporteur* (1388, *Liv. roug.*, Arch. Nat., G., Comp.); et on est étonné de voir que bien plus tard, au xv^e et au xvii^e, le procédé ne sera pas oublié, et que, sans être de grand usage—il ne l'a été à aucune époque—il donnera naissance à *culbuter* (Marot, *Métam.*, 2); *chantourner* (de *chant* et *tourner*, scier de façon que le champ de la planche tourne, Cotgr., 1611),' *Histoire de la Langue Française*, I, p. 506.

cases at least, their origin may not be explained in ways more in harmony with the genius of French.

The toll of words given by Darmesteter¹ and reproduced for the greater part by Nyrop is as follows: Verbs, *billebarrer*, *blanc-poudrer*, *bouleverser*, *boursouffler*, *cailleboter*, *chantourner*, *champlever*, *chavirer*, *cloufichier*, *colporter*, *culbuter*, *ferarmer*, *ferlier*, *fervestir*, *maintenir*, *manœuvrer*, *mentevoir*, *morfondre*, *pelleverser*, *saupoudrer*; Participles or Adjectives, *blanc-signé*, *Dieudonné*, *saugrenu*, *tranche-maçoné*, *vermoulu*. Of this list the words printed in Roman type are quoted anew in the 'Traité de la Formation de la Langue Française'² in the first volume of the *Dictionnaire Général*, which gives as further examples: *bousculer*, *court-mancher*, *houspiller*, and ends its list with a convenient and comprehensive *et cetera*. It is a motley gathering, in which certain words, *court-mancher*³ for example, produce a particularly discordant note, and, in general, in the later words⁴, one is struck by the extreme diversity not to say vagueness in the function of the noun element: 'by worms' (*vermoulu*), 'on the neck' (place where) (*colporter*), 'on the cul' (place to) (*culbuter*), 'like a ball' (*bouleverser*), a diversity which is in marked contrast to the clear-cut instrumental function of the noun in the older examples: *maintenir*, *fervestir*, *cloufichier*.

In Darmesteter's *Mots Composés* the band is marshalled under the standard of the verb *maintenir*, which he chooses as the typical example of these noun plus verb compounds, but we shall not consider this word at length as it is clearly a Latin inheritance. Be it said, however, that it would seem a bold assertion indeed to affirm that *maintenir* preserved in full vigour, even in the earliest French period, the meaning of 'to hold with the hand,' and that it could thus serve as a model for similar compounds; bolder still if we bear in mind the Provençal *captener*, of kindred meaning, where *cap-* is definitely objective, not instrumental⁵. It even seems fair to suggest that on analysis by the ordinary speaker the word *maintenir* is as likely to be felt as a compound of verb plus

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 161 f.

² *Dictionnaire Général*, I, p. 86.

³ Happily, if a little inconsistently, in the body of the dictionary, s.v. *Court-mancher*, the word is explained as a direct derivative from the words *court manche*.

⁴ Presuming, of course, for the time being, that Darmesteter's explanation of these words is correct.

⁵ E. L. Adams, *Word Formation in Provençal*, New York, 1913, is mistaken when he asserts that in Provençal verbs composed of noun+verb 'the noun is never the object of the verb.' He makes no mention of such common verbs as *captener* and *capfrenar*; clearly because he has confined himself to Levy's *Supplement-Wörterbuch*, where the words do not appear, although they stand in their place in the *Petit Dictionnaire*. For an interesting discussion of the French compounds of object+verb see Spitzer, *Zeitschr. f. roman. Phil.*, XLII, p. 21.

object as of verb plus instrumental noun. But we can leave *maintenir*, which Darmesteter himself abandoned in the introductory treatise to the *Dictionnaire Général*, and consider the word *colporter* which he there gives as the typical example of the group and of definitely French formation. Here we cease to be on speculative ground.

COLPORTER.

Colporter is explained by Littré as being formed of *col* and *porter* and as meaning originally 'porter sur le cou or col,' and this is repeated by Darmesteter and by the *Dictionnaire Général*. But the weakness of this explanation is that it takes no account of the early history of the word and of its older form which was *comporter*: '*comporter par la vile de Paris*' in Estienne Boileau's *Livre des Mestiers* (thirteenth century), and *com-porteor* in the same text; similarly '*petiz comporteurs aval la ville de Paris*' in a text of 1351 (v. Godefroy), and '*comporteurs marchans portans aval la ville*' in a text of 1388 (*ibid.*). The verb *colporter* does not occur till fairly late, but as the first example of *colporteur* given by Godefroy is dated 1388, and as a substantive *colporteur* without a verb *colporter* would be in the nature of a monstrosity¹, we can safely assert that the verb *colporter* was in existence before this date, and that it is a fourteenth-century product. *Comporter*, as we shall show, has a much more ancient title, and no etymology can claim to be satisfactory which concerns itself exclusively with the late-comer and neglects the time-honoured predecessor in the estate. The key to a complete solution, and, incidentally, an interesting sidelight on other problems will be found if we study for a moment the form and function of the prefix *con-* in French.

The function of this prefix as a living and popular element in the formation of French verbs² is intensive, frequentative or pejorative, as will be seen from the following examples taken from Godefroy:

Combrisier, 'to break to pieces,' often used with *tout* which marks the emphasis: *il m'a toute combrisée*; *que tu combrises cette ymaige toute en poudre*.

Commenuisier, 'to reduce to small pieces'; one example: *adonc chei une partie del temple et est commenuisée*.

Commouvoir, a very frequent intensive of *mouvoir*: *et tute Normendie cumëue e trublée*.

¹ Such monsters do however appear, witness the modern *haut-parleur*, whose origin is not far to seek.

² Nyrop makes no mention of this value of *con-*. K. Jæberg, *Rev. de Linguistique rom.*, I, p. 141, admits its vitality in French '*trotzdem es nicht volkstümlich war*.' He gives numerous examples and points to the necessity for a full enquiry into its function in Low Latin and Romance.

Complaindre, intensive of *plaindre*: *compleinent* sei, si se dementent; Einsi com s'il fust hors du sens, Regrete s'amie et *complaint*.

Comploration: miserable *comploration*; *comploration* piteuse.

Compresser, intensive of *presser*.

Concasser, intensive of *casser*.

Conceler, frequent as a pejorative form of *celer*.

Conchier, 'to defile thoroughly, to deride, to mock outrageously.'

Conclamer, 'to proclaim aloud.'

Concreistre; of the three examples given by Godefroy two may be considered as pejorative.

Concueillir, which, incidentally, has the prefix twice over, once as a Latin inheritance, once as a living prefix, and is thus, perhaps, the most interesting example, is sometimes neutral, 'to gather,' sometimes frequentative, 'to go gathering,' sometimes definitely pejorative, especially in the participle and in the derived words *conquellis*, *conqueltis*, etc., which Godefroy translates 'ramassé de tous côtés': glener ne *conqueillir* ou rateler foin (1398); Codrus assembla et *concueillit* petis esclatz et menues buchettes espandues sur le rivage de la mer (1515); que l'on *concuillist* boue et ordure parmi les rues; Feble gent sunt, mauvais et *concueillis*; gent *concueillie* de diverses nacions est tost desconfite, etc. etc.

To these, many other examples might be added, including *confoler*, *confondre*, *confraindre*, *confroissier*, *controver*. Thus the meaning of O.F. *comporter* becomes abundantly clear: it is a frequentative or intensive of *porter* and means simply 'to carry about from place to place.' If further proof is needed it can be found in the following passage from one of the vernacular sermons of Saint Bernard given by Godefroy: si cum on greveroit un malade s'om l'aleivet dehurtant et *comportant* cei ei lai, or in this line from the fabliau *Les Trois Boçus*: tant t'averai hui *conporté*¹. The survival of this function of *comporter* as late as the sixteenth century, as well as the confusion it entailed, is attested by the following quotations from the introduction to M. Huguet's dictionary of sixteenth-century French, now in course of publication: '*Comporter* s'employait dans le sens de *supporter*, *se comporter* dans celui de *se transporter*'; '*porter* signifiait souvent *comporter*, *se porter* avait souvent le sens de *se comporter*; *porter* signifiait aussi *supporter*.' Of the passages substantiating these statements the following is the most relevant to our present topic: Quand dans un verger de plaisance Lasse elle alloit *se comportant*.—Buttet, Ode 2.

¹ Cp. in the *Thesaurus*: *Comportatrix*, a gloss for *gerula*, *nutrix*.

A word now as to the phonological development of the prefix. Before a consonant other than a liquid the forms *con-* and *com-*, that is to say, forms with a nasalised vowel are those most frequently found in French, but it is generally admitted that the preservation of the nasal is due to learned influence, and that the alternative treatment, with denasalisation and (generally) darkening of the vowel, as in *conventum* > *couvent*, represents a more popular and unrestricted development; witness the O.F. forms *covenir*, *coversier*, etc.; cp. also the following typical spellings from Godefroy: *coprehendé* (1266), *copresse* (*compresse*), *gouffanon* and *coffenon* (*gonfanon*), and inversely *componné* (*couponné*, 'terme de blason'); cp. further Picard *copère* for *compère*¹, French *copain* as against *compagnon*². Moreover, in its denasalled form, the prefix is still vigorous and exists in Walloon, *co-* at Namur, *ki-* further East, as an intensive verbal prefix, with a function similar to that we find it exercising in Old French. *Kitourner* (Nam. *cotourner*) is explained as 'retourner dans tous les sens,' *kiminer* as 'mener partout,' *kitchèssi* as 'chasser quelqu'un de partout où il se réfugie'³.

The present stage of our argument is therefore as follows: O.F. *comporter* means 'to carry about from place to place' and as a popular word, with its most popular, if specialised, meaning 'to hawk,' is pronounced *couporter*. What happens to *couporter* the lowly twin-brother of the learned *comporter*? Does it suddenly die, and yield its place to a newborn *colporter*, bred of the verb *porter* and a *col* meaning 'neck,' whose final consonant was probably nothing but a phantom in 1388, the date of the first appearance of *colporteur* in the texts? Obviously not; and the presence of *comporteur* on the next page of the 1388 text⁴ proves it, if proof were needed. *Colporter* is *comporter* (*couporter*) in disguise.

How are we to account for the new spelling? And is anything wrong with **couporter* that makes a substitute desirable? It may be that the 'l,' like the 'd' of *poids*, is merely due to a false etymology, a learned association with *collum*. It may be that the adoption of the spelling with 'l' (a spelling always possible in an age of chaotic orthography and vanishing consonants⁵) was at first a mere accident, and that rival

¹ Corblet, *Glossaire du Patois Picard*.

² The word *concombre*, for O.F. *cocombre*, usually explained as due to assimilation, may be due to a 'gauloiserie' rendered possible by the period of hesitation in the pronunciation of the prefix *co-*, *con-* which accounts for mod. *convoiter* for old *covoitier*.

³ Feller, *Notes de Philologie Wallonne*, p. 233: 'Il peut s'adjoindre à tout verbe en qui il est possible de marquer l'intensité de l'action par répétition de l'acte initial.'

⁴ V. *supra*.

⁵ Cp. the spellings given by Godefroy for O.F. *coute pointe*, mod. *courte-pointe*: *couste*, *coulte*, *kiolte*, *coute*, *quieurt*, etc. As an instance of what this instability of consonants, coupled with an etymologising propensity can bring about, take the following extract

spellings **corporter* or **courporter* may also have existed; cp. Picard *courtour* 'tromperie, mauvais tour'¹ which is a *contour* > *coutour* from *contourner* (Nam. *cotourner* 'retourner dans tous les sens'); cp. also *courbon* (var. *caubon*) in *Mistère de la Passion*, v. 15,657, which is identical with O.F. *combon* (also *combonneor*) 'accomplice'. But Gilliéron has taught us to be chary of attributing to mere accident or gratuitous learned interference every deviation from normal phonetic development. The 'l' introduced into **couporter*, whether by accident or by design or by both, had the merit of shifting the word from the orbit of *coup* and *couper* (*qui le couporté avoit* = *qui le coup porté avoit*) and of bringing it into association with *colier*, *coulrier*, 'portefaix,' 'homme qui traîne une petite voiture, une brouette,' of which examples will be found in Godefroy as late as the fifteenth century.

It also had a further advantage, very relevant to our present argument, that of eliminating or at least attenuating the mental association of the verb with *cou*. The 'colporteur' may carry his wares in different ways: strung from his neck, in a bundle on his back, on a donkey or a pack-horse, in a hand-cart or other more pretentious vehicle, and might reasonably object to be called a 'neck-carrier' (!) in every case. It seems fair therefore to suggest that *colporter*, so far from being a compound of *col* 'neck' and *porter*, owes its origin to a desire to escape from a form which phonetically had drifted into too close an association with *cou* 'neck' (already victorious over the early form *col* in this sense). In any case, we have further proof of the dissatisfaction that was felt with *comporteur-couporteur* in the form *contreporteur* which came into existence apparently at about the same period and for a long time was a favoured rival to *colporteur*.

The first example I know of *contreporteur* is found in Pasquier's *Recherches de la France*, Book VIII, ch. lxii. The passage is worth quoting. Pasquier is discussing certain expressions and words which to him are corrupt. He says, 'Les revendeurs des livres qui les portent à leur col par la ville, sont appelez *Contreporteurs* d'un mot corrompu, au lieu de *Colporteurs*.' We need not take Pasquier's explanation of the origin of *contreporteur* too seriously, as on the same page he tells us that 'la

from R. Estienne's *Pet. Dict. fr.-lat.*: 'Pomme de *capendu* ou *carpendu* quasi qui droit *court-pendu*, Malum *curtipendulum*,' where the older *capendu* is first of all gratuitously given an 'r' and then *car-* is changed to *court*. Littré gives both *capendu* and *court-pendu* as alternative modern forms. Incidentally this is some confirmation of Feller's theory that the so-called pejorative prefix *ca-* is really a by-form of the pejorative *co-*, *ki*, found in Walloon.

¹ Corblat, *op. cit.*

² O.F. *coutiver* (cultiver) appears as *curtiver*, *cortiver*, *costiver*; cp. *artillerie* > O.F. *atillier*, Thomas, *Essais*, p. 244; *Mostivilliers*, to-day *Montivilliers*, *ibid.*, p. 408.

chaussée' is really 'la haussée,' and that 'sonner le beffroy' should really be 'sonner l'effroy'! But his remark is interesting as confirming what the later dictionaries lead us to infer that *colporter* and *colporteur* were not entirely satisfactory as substitutes for **couporter* and **couporteur*, but that more radical attempts had been made to remedy the defects of these words. *Contreporter* and *contreporteur* enjoy favour over a fairly long period. Des Perriers uses the verb, and the noun is found in the Dictionaries of Monnet, Nicot and Oudin¹. It seems as though, during what we may call the etymologising period, the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in other words, *colporter* is still in too close association with 'cou' to be satisfactory, in fact, really comes to be felt as meaning 'porter sur le col' and thus useless as a generic term for 'to hawk, to carry about.' That would explain the curious use of the word attested by Nicot: *Colporter, porter sur le col*, Efferre cadaver, collo gestare; Estre colporté, Efferri funere. Nicot has no word *colporteur*, only *contreporteur*, which he translates *circuitor*. Cotgrave has both *colporteur* and *contreporteur*. His verb is *colporter*, for which he gives the usual meaning, and Nicot's as well, whom he obviously follows.

In the seventeenth century the star of *contreporteur*, -eur, wanes and *colporter* triumphs, maybe because the etymologising tendency is not so strong or so widespread, and because the objections to *colporter* yield to the pressure of the survivors of **couporter* which probably existed in the provinces, maybe for reasons which escape us. Ménage² gives *contreporteur* and the quotation from Pasquier. He then adds: 'Nous les appellons aujourd'hui Colporteurs.' Then follows, in the 1750 edition of Ménage, an addition by Le Duchat: 'Le mot colporteur n'est pas une corruption de contreporteur. Celui-ci est l'ancien nom donné à cette sorte de merciers parce qu'ils portent leurs marchandises dans un panier appuyé contre leur estomac. Dans la suite on les a nommé (sic) colporteurs, parce que ce panier leur pend au cou.' We hardly expect that Le Duchat's explanation of *contreporteur* will find acceptance³; both his chronology and his philology are at fault, and we submit that the usual derivation of *colporter* is just as inadequate, and for the same reasons. The 'l' of this word is no more (and possibly no less) justifiable phonologically than the 'r' of *courtepointe*⁴, and it would follow that Darne-

¹ Monnet, *Inventaire des langues française et latine*, 1636; Nicot, *Tresor de la langue française*, 1606; Oudin, *Recherches italiennes, ou Dictionnaire italien et français*, 1640.

² *Dictionnaire Etymologique*, 1650.

³ *Contreporter* is in all probability composed of *con-* and O.F. *tre(s)porter* 'to transport,' and has nothing to do with *contre*. It is a stronger *con-porter*.

⁴ Some homonymic clash is probably at the back of the 'r' of *courtepointe*: *coutepointe*, *queutepointe*—*coup de pointe*, *queue de pointe*.

steter's choice of the word in the *Dictionnaire Général* as the typical example of the process of word-formation we are discussing is, to say the least, a singularly unhappy one.

COURBATU, COURBATURE.

Before turning to another word in the series, it is perhaps not out of place to set forth a further etymology to which our enquiry into the function and form of the intensive prefix *con-* seems to give the key, namely that of the words *courbatu* and *courbature*. Here is Littré's discussion of the word *courbatu*: 'Quelques-uns le tirent de *courbature*¹; mais comment *courbature* aurait-il donné *courbatu*? pas plus que *conjecture* ne pourrait donner *conjectu*. *Courbatu* semble formé de *court* et *battu*; le sens de cette composition serait battre de court, battre à bras raccourcis, très-bien battre. Cette conjecture est vraisemblable et par conséquent préférable à cette autre: *courb-battu*, battu de manière à se courber. Le verbe n'est pas usité; cependant il l'est dans les campagnes des environs de Paris: la fièvre le courbat.' The *Dictionnaire Général*, s.v. *Courbatu*, has no doubts on the matter: 'Pour court-battu,' it says, 'composé de court et battu; proprement, battre à bras raccourcis.' Surely this is an amazingly pregnant meaning to assign to the syllable *cour-*!

The series *combrisier*, *concasser*, *commenuisier*, *confraindre*, *confroissier*, *confoler*, *conchier*, *compisser*, etc., clamours for a *combattre* (pronounced *coubattre*) with the meaning 'to beat about, to belabour.' And the word exists to this day in Walloon: *kibatre*, 'battre ensemble, mêler des objets en se battant, en les battant, gâcher' (Grandgagnage)². Such a word could exist side by side with a less popular form *combattre*, just as in Walloon *kirompe* or *kirompi* (pcp. *kirompou*, *c'rompou*) has the meaning of 'to break at various places,' whereas *corompe* (*corompou*) has the same meaning as the French word *corrompre* which it represents³. In short, *courbatu* (whence *courbature*) is an early **cobatu*, **coubatu*⁴, corresponding to Walloon *kibatou*, and means originally 'belaboured.' Its 'r' is an ex-crescence, like the 'r' of *courtepointe*, like the 'r' of *courbon* for O.F. *combon*, of Picard *courtour* for *contour*, of *cortiver* for O.F. *coutiver*, of *courvretoir* ('couverture,' Godefroy), of *courper* for O.F. *coulper*, etc. etc.

¹ Littré refers to Sainte-Palaye and to Ménage, who derive *courbature* from *curvatura*.

² Cf. *co-bouter*, 'rudoyer,' at Namur; see also Gamillscheg, *Franz. Etym. in Zeitschr. f. roman. Phil.*, xl, pp. 166ff.

³ Feller, *op. cit.*, p. 228.

⁴ The only example given by Godefroy which points to a *combattre* intensive of *battre* is the expression, dated 1341, *combate mens de chastiaux*, 'the breaking down of castles (?).'

The process is the reverse of what we see at work in *faufiler* and *faubourg* for *forfiler* and *forbourg* and shows a similar instability of the 'r'¹. Like the 'l' of *colporter* it doubtless fulfils some useful linguistic function, and may indeed be a similar device to avoid association with the word *cou*.

Courbatu, according to Littré, whose statement is confirmed by early examples, is primarily a technical term belonging to the language of the horse-dealer and the veterinary surgeon. The development of meaning is thus quite clear: 'bruised and belaboured,' 'driven to death,' 'broken-winded' and so on. Rabelais, says Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye, uses it of a man 'assommé de coups,' which is not as Sainte-Palaye suggests, a derived meaning, but the original one. To clinch the argument it is sufficient to consider the following passage from A. Greban's *Mistère de la Passion*, v. 26,352, quoted by Godefroy:

Nous sommes cy tant *courbatus*
Et de rage tant *abatus*
Qu'il ne nous tient plus de courrie.

On referring to the variants we discover that the spelling *courbatus* is found only in the MS. A; the other MSS. B and C give *combatus*, and they are actually, according to the editors, G. Paris and Raynaud, some thirty years younger than A. The word also occurs at v. 29,304 of the same work; here A gives *corps batu* (*sic*), B and C *corbatu*.

(*To be continued.*)

JOHN ORR.

MANCHESTER.

¹ Compare also as a further parallel modern *basculer* with O.F. *baculer*.

SOME NEW LIGHT ON 'L'ÉCOSSAISE' OF ANTOINE DE MONTCHRÉTIEN

IN spite of the researches of modern scholars a good deal of obscurity still surrounds the work and the lives of that group of men who were the pioneers of classical tragedy in France. In particular the career of Antoine de Montchrétien contains elements of mystery which have never been satisfactorily cleared up. Since so little is known of the man and of his work, the following small discoveries in connexion with *L'Écossaise*, Montchrétien's most celebrated play, may be of interest to students of that mysterious poet and economist.

Able critics have dealt with the literary and aesthetic aspects of *L'Écossaise*, pointing out its importance as one of the finest examples of the sixteenth-century type of classical tragedy and its value as lyric poetry. Attention has also been drawn to the interesting fact that the subject of the play, the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, was drawn from modern, almost contemporary, history, instead of dealing with the usual classical or biblical themes, and this is the point which it is the purpose of the present article to develop.

It was not a new idea to use contemporary events as the subject of a play; to quote only two examples, Pierre Matthieu dramatised the assassination of the Guises in 1589, and in 1612 Claude Billard put the murder of Henri IV on the stage. In fact the dramatisation of contemporary events seems to have been used as a kind of political journalism in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Montchrétien's play on the death of Mary Stuart, although immeasurably superior in execution to the general run of these political plays, is not unlike them in subject and design and the question arises whether or not *L'Écossaise* was intended by the author to carry a political implication. There are in effect two references among English diplomatic records of the period, which have, I believe, hitherto escaped the notice of students of Montchrétien, and which would seem to prove beyond all doubt that this play was considered by some contemporaries to have a dangerous political significance.

In Sir Ralph Winwood's *Memorials*, there is a letter from Winwood at Paris to Cecil, dated 17 March 1601, O.S., in which the following passage occurs:

Since the beginning of Lent, certaine base Comedians have publicklye plaied in this Towne the Tragedy of the late Queen of Scottes. The King being then at

Vernueil, I had no other recourse but to the Chancellor; who upon my complaint was very sensible of that so lewde an Indiscretion, and in my hearing gave an especial Charge to the Lieutenant Civill, (to whose Duty the Provisions for such Disorder doth appertaine,) to have a care, both that this Folly should be punished, and that the like hereafter should not be committed. Since, Monsieur de Villeroy (upon the Notice which I gave him) doth promise that he will give order both for the Punishment of that which is past, and for future Remedy¹.

It might be argued that as the author is not here mentioned by name and as the title is given in English, we have no certain proof that Winwood is indeed speaking of Montchrétien's play on the death of the Queen of Scots. There may, of course, have been other plays on the same subject extant. But the precise way in which this information of Winwood's fits in with a letter found by L. Auvray, which has hitherto constituted the only known mention of a performance of *L'Écossaise*, proves, in my opinion at least, that the English ambassador is indeed referring to Montchrétien's play and to no other. I beg leave to quote in full the letter found by M. Auvray among the correspondence of Pomponne de Bellièvre in order that it may be compared with Winwood's:

Lettre de M. de Beauharnais, lieutenant général à Orléans, au chancelier Pomponne de Bellièvre.

Monseigneur,

Pour obéir à voz commandemens, je me suis tres soigneusement enquis quels estoient ces comédiens qui avoient joué en cete ville, depuis deux mois ou environ, une tragédie sur la mort de la feue royne d'Ecosse, et n'ay peu apprendre autre chose, sinon que le chef de leur compaignie se nomme La Vallée, et qu'ilz sont partis de cete ville depuis ung mois ou six sepmaines, sans que j'aye peu scavoir où ilz sont allez. Mais j'ay tant fait, que j'ay recouvré ung livre de tragédies, la première desquelles, nommée 'l'Ecossoise' autrement 'le Désastre,' est celle mesme qu'ilz ont représentée, ainsi qu'il m'a esté asseuré par gens d'honneur qui y ont assisté. Je vous envoie, Monseigneur, ce livre, tres marry que je ne puis obéir entièrement à ce que vous m'avez commandé, et supplie Dieu le Créateur vous donner, Monseigneur, heureuse yssue de tous vos desirs et vous conserver en longue vie pour le repos de ce royaume. A Orléans, ce xxi juin 1603.

Vostre très humble serviteur,

Beauharnois,

lieutenant général à Orléans².

The details given by Beauharnais establish beyond all doubt that he is certainly referring to Montchrétien's play; *L'Ecossoise* ou *le Désastre* is its exact title in the first edition, and in that edition it is the first play in the book. And if we now compare Beauharnais' letter with Winwood's, I think we shall be convinced that they are both writing about the same play.

¹ Sir Ralph Winwood, *Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I*, 1725, I, p. 398.

² Published in the *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, 1897, pp. 89-91.

The significant points of the comparison can be summarised thus: in March 1601, Winwood complained to the Chancellor about a public performance of the 'Tragedy of the late Queen of Scottes.' The Chancellor proclaimed himself 'very sensible of that so lewde an Indiscretion' and gave orders to prevent its occurring again. In June 1603, the Chancellor (the same man, Pomponne de Bellièvre, was still in office) wrote to Orleans to enquire who had been acting in that town 'une tragédie sur la mort de la feue royne d'Ecosse'—an exact translation, be it noticed, of the expression Winwood uses to describe the play. Evidently the Chancellor was keeping the promise he made to Winwood and was doing his best to prevent the performance of a play which gave offence to the English ambassador and was considered unbecoming by the French authorities themselves.

But the incident was not even yet closed, as the following extract from a hitherto unpublished dispatch among the State Papers at the Public Record Office shows. The English ambassador (Parry) at Paris writes to Cecil on 13 February 1604 as follows:

The Comedians, ye heretofore sd, bn. prohibited to represent on stadge ye Tragedy of ye death of ye k. mother, adventured this weeke to act it agayne publickly. But ye k. counsel advised of it, caused them ye next morning to be apprehended and imprisoned, where they yeat remayn: besides ye booke is suppressed, and the author and ye printer inquired after to tast of ye same cupp. The k. shewed hymself very highly offended, and hath commanded very rigourous punishment to be done on them al¹.

There is little doubt, I think, that we have here to do with Montchrétien's play again. Parry especially states that the subject has been mentioned before: 'The Comedians, ye heretofore sd, bn. prohibited etc.' Also it is known that La Vallée, whom Beauharnais mentions as the leader of the troupe which performed *L'Écossaise* at Orleans, and his company were at the Hôtel de Bourgogne in 1604², the year in which Parry writes. It was therefore almost certainly at the Hôtel de Bourgogne that the performance of which Parry speaks took place.

The most interesting aspect of these two new documents—Winwood's letter of 1601 and Parry's of 1604—is the proof which they afford of two public performances in Paris of *L'Écossaise* by professional comedians. This, with the performance at Orleans recorded by Beauharnais, brings the total number of public performances of this play of which we now have proof up to three. The old view that the sixteenth-century type of classical play, of which Garnier and Montchrétien are the chief

¹ P.R.O. State Papers, Foreign, France, 51.

² See Rigal, *Le théâtre français avant la période classique*, p. 50.

exponents, was not meant by its authors to be acted on the public stage has been gradually exploded by the evidence of actual public performances of such plays which M. Lanson has collected¹. The evidence of Winwood and Parry adds two further small items to M. Lanson's list. *L'Écossaise* must have had a considerable vogue with the public since the comedians continued to present it in face of such risks.

Secondly these documents are of interest since they are a small addition to the very fragmentary material from which the biography of Montchrétien has to be constructed.

'Ye booke is suppressed,' Parry tells us. It is strange to hear this because it was in 1604 that the new and emended edition of Montchrétien's tragedies appeared at Rouen. Perhaps these happenings account for the depressed tone of the preface of the new edition, addressed to the Prince de Condé. 'S'il m'estoit possible de les dégager (i.e., les tragédies) totalement du public,' says Montchrétien, 'ce me seroit un grand contentement et par mon propre consentement elles seroient desormais plustost supprimées que reimprimées.'

'The author and ye printer inquired after,' continues Parry. Is it not possible that this affair may have been at the bottom of Montchrétien's hasty departure into England which biographers, following the *Mercure François*, have hitherto attributed solely to his having killed the son of the Sieur de Grichy-Moinnes in a duel?

It must be confessed that these documents tend to increase rather than diminish the mystery of Montchrétien's life. How can one reconcile these records of complaints of *L'Écossaise* made by English representatives in France with the legend that Montchrétien dedicated this very play to James I, and through James's intercession with Henri IV on his behalf, obtained permission to return to France? The following is the passage from the *Mercure François* on which this tale is based:

Il (Montchrétien) a esté des bons poetes tragiques de son temps; il fit imprimer plusieurs tragedies qu'il avoit composées, lesquelles furent bien receues: entr' autres il desdia l'Ecossoise au Roy de la Grande Bretagne, ce qui lui sauva la vie; car s'estant trouvé en un rencontre accusé d'avoir tué le fils du sieur de Grichy moyennes pres Bayeux, en feignant de luy demander la vie, il s'en alla en Angleterre, crainte d'estre pendu, jusques à ce que sa M. de la grande Bretagne obtint du feu roy Henry 4 sa grace².

It is, perhaps, not inconsistent with what we know or can guess of Montchrétien's character that he should have taken the bold step of

¹ G. Lanson, *Études sur les Origines de la Tragédie Classique en France*. Article published in the *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, 1903, pp. 177-231, 413-36.

² *Documents concernant la Normandie* (extracts from *Le Mercure François*), edited A. Héron, 1883, p. 188.

dedicating to the English monarch the very play which had given offence to the English authorities. He may have taken the bull by the horns and turned failure into success by these impudent methods. But it is also very possible that the author of the passage in the *Mercure*, who is writing some fifteen years after the events, may have been misinformed, or may be giving an intentionally misleading account of the connexion between *L'Écossaise* and the British Government¹. At any rate he confirms the fact that there was some such connexion, even though the details he gives seem difficult to reconcile with the information we have derived from the ambassadors' dispatches. It is possible that further search among English correspondence of the period might throw more light on this problem.

Why did the English ambassadors disapprove of a play which seems to us now a most mild and harmless elegy on the death of the ill-fated queen? What can have been the political significance of *L'Écossaise* in the eyes of contemporaries? Let us now turn to the play itself, and dismissing from our minds all aesthetic considerations, let us endeavour to discern what are the political views which it reveals or fails to reveal.

Practically every critic who has ever had anything to say about *L'Écossaise* has been struck by the remarkable fact that the last three acts seem to have no logical connexion with the first two. The play falls into two distinct halves. The heroine of the first half is Queen Elizabeth. She is represented as being most unwilling to give the order for Mary's execution. She shrinks from an act which seems to her cruel and unwomanly and brings forward every argument she can think of in Mary's defence. But her counsellors lay before her the reasons which render the execution of the Queen of Scots imperative—namely, that she is known to have been plotting with the Spaniards and other enemies of England. These plots have had for their object nothing less than the assassination of Elizabeth and the seizure of the throne for Mary. Nothing but Mary's execution will put a stop to these continually renewed conspiracies, which are a menace not merely to Elizabeth but also to England. In the name of her subjects, the representatives of Parliament implore Elizabeth to put an end to the life of the treasonable queen. Overwhelmed by this reasoning Elizabeth consents to Mary's death, and then, touched again by pity, rescinds the order. Montchrétien leaves her at that point and does not show Elizabeth actually giving the

¹ The passage in the *Mercure* was written by a political enemy of Montchrétien and is very likely to be unjust and unreliable. Funck-Brentano, in his introduction to Montchrétien's *Traité de l'économie politique* (1889), p. xii, note i, finds the story of the dedication of *L'Écossaise* to James I difficult to believe.

order for Mary's death. Elizabeth, then, is represented as having been unwillingly forced to the deed for the good of her subjects. In short the first two acts are a presentation of what one may call broadly the English-Huguenot view of the subject.

In the last three acts we hear no more of Elizabeth and her counsellors. Mary, the noble and innocent victim of a cruel sentence, holds the centre of the stage. She is shown going to meet her death with nobility and fortitude, and the poet appears to be doing all he can to engage the sympathies of the reader on Mary's side. Great stress is laid on the enormity of putting a lady of royal blood to death in this manner and the choruses expatiate on the sacred immunity from violence which should surround the persons of kings. In these last acts Montchrétien seems to have gone over completely to the French-Catholic position.

It is therefore somewhat difficult to decide what the politics and religion (the two were inseparably bound together at that period) of our author really were, since he states the two opposite positions consecutively without making any attempt to reconcile them. He gives more space to Mary, and his heart seems to be much more in her defence than in that of Elizabeth, therefore some biographers have concluded that he was a Catholic when he wrote *L'Écossaise*, although he would appear to have gone over to the Protestant side later in life.

It is my belief, however, that Montchrétien's two-sided presentation of the subject is less original than at first appears. I suggest that Pierre Matthieu's *Histoire des derniers troubles de France* (1597) should be added to the list of sources of *L'Écossaise* compiled by M. Lanson in his article on the subject¹. Matthieu's *Histoire des derniers troubles* was widely read by contemporaries, as the number of editions it went through proves, and at the end of the second book there is a fairly long 'Digression sur la mort de la Roynne d'Escosse,' the argument of which can be briefly condensed as follows.

France mourned at the death of the Queen of Scots, whereas in England it was a cause of rejoicing. After making this statement Matthieu proceeds to examine the arguments which support these two contrary opinions and he casts his examination in the form of a dialogue between a Frenchman and an Englishman, the former supporting Mary whilst the latter is the champion of Elizabeth. The keystone of the Englishman's argument is that since Mary had been conspiring against the safety of the realm, reasons of state made her execution imperative.

¹ G. Lanson, *Les sources historiques de la 'Reine D'Escosse,'* published in the *Revue Universitaire*, 1905, p. 395.

He describes at length Elizabeth's reluctance to consent to the deed, and the pressure put upon her by her counsellors and by the 'Estats d'Angleterre' (compare Montchrétien's 'chœur des Estats'). 'Le Chancelier, au nom des trois ordres d'Angleterre, la supplia de laisser le cours à la Justice.' This is also the plea of the 'chœur des Estats' in *L'Écossaise*:

Ains que tu permettras que la iuste sentence
Donnee en plain Conseil en ta sainte presence
Contre ceste Princesse, aye son libre cours...¹.

'Puckering Procureur general, luy remonstra que la longue prison, ny la continuation de la bien veillance de sa Maïesté n'avoit peu fleschir une ame tant ingrate et obstinee, qu'elle n'eust souvent entrepris contre sa vie, et la tranquillité de sa Couronne....' Compare this with:

Quoy que de sa prison l'ennuyeuse longueur
Peust un iuste courroux allumer en son cœur;
Par mon doux traitement elle devoit l'esteindre,
Se plaignant en son mal de ne s'en pouoir plaindre:
Mais l'on m'a rapporté qu'en ce dernier effort,
Elle brigue mon Sceptre, et minute ma mort.
Seroit-ce donc l'amour, Ame ingrate et legere,
Que me iuroit sans fin ta bouche mensongere?

Matthieu's 'Chancelier' and 'Puckering Procureur general' correspond to Montchrétien's 'Conseiller' who argues with Elizabeth in the first act of *L'Écossaise*; in the second act 'Conseiller' disappears and his argument is continued by the 'chœur des Estats.' Montchrétien exactly follows Matthieu's order in this; for we read in the *Histoire des derniers troubles* that when the Chancelier and Puckering had exposed their arguments: 'Elle (i.e., Elizabeth) non contente de ses remonstrances envoya encores un Milord à Messieurs du Parlement, les supplier d'es-prouver tout pour sauver la vie à ceste Roine...lesquels encores qu'ils regrettassent le desastre de ceste Princesse, trouverent que la Roine feroit bien de s'asseurer.' Notice the word 'desastre' in this passage, used by Montchrétien as a sub-title to his play.

What would you have had the Queen do? asks Matthieu's Englishman, amongst all these 'contraires agitations.' She was warned by M. de Believre³, he continues, that Mary's death would raise an avenging host of relations and allies. Compare Montchrétien:

Les Roys qui font mourir ceux qui leur sont contraires,
Pensant les amoindrir, croissent leurs aduersaires...⁴.

¹ Lines 389-91 in the edition published under the direction of G. Michaut, Paris, 1905.

² *Ed. cit.*, ll. 47-54.

³ Curiously enough this 'M. de Believre,' sent by Henri III to remonstrate with Elizabeth on her treatment of the Queen of Scots, is the same Pomponne de Bellièvre who later, as Chancellor, took proceedings against the players for the 'lewde Indiscretion' of performing *L'Écossaise*.

⁴ *Ed. cit.*, ll. 189-90.

But the Englishman thinks this an idle objection. 'Pour éviter un grand danger il se faut hasarder au danger.' In short, I believe I am right in saying that every argument used by Montchrétien in the first two acts can be traced to this passage in the *Histoire des derniers troubles*.

Matthieu's Frenchman bases his argument on the premise that a sovereign prince is above all human laws and answerable only to God. Elizabeth and her Parliament had therefore absolutely no right to pass a sentence on the Queen of Scots. 'Quant aux souverains qui ne recognoissent superieur que Dieu, je ne lis point que jamais ils aient passé par les arrests d'un Parlement, ny au jugement de leurs voisins.' There is no form of punishment which can ever be applied to a sovereign, and to inflict on a queen the indignity of a public execution was a most unheard-of sacrilege. Compare Montchrétien:

On fait si peu de cas du sacré sang Royal
Que la hache s'en trempe et le bras desloyal
L'espend ne plus ne moins que le sang mercenaire;
On donne aux maiestez le supplice vulgaire...¹.

In short to Matthieu's Frenchman, as to Montchrétien in the last three acts, Mary is the innocent victim of a cruel and unjustifiable sentence.

I hope I have said enough to prove that this passage of Matthieu's must have suggested the plan of *L'Écossaise* to Montchrétien². The discrepancy which we have noted between the first two and the last three acts of the play is thus explained; Montchrétien has simply presented the Englishman's argument in the first two and the Frenchman's in the last three acts. Like Matthieu, he gives far more space and weight to the French argument without ever definitely condemning the English position. Matthieu's closing paragraph may even have suggested to the poet the larger philosophical significance of Mary's fate, as a type of the transitory nature of fame and beauty and the shortness of human life. 'Voilà une vie bien tragique, et un vray tableau de la vanité des grandeurs du monde,' says Matthieu, and concludes his 'digression' with the exclamation, 'Allez faire estat des felicités du monde!' The historian's prose style, pompous and stilted though it is, is capable of achieving a certain dignity at times.

It is, perhaps, not irrelevant to add here that some years later Pierre Matthieu, like Montchrétien, also got into trouble with the English ambassador. The incident is related in the State Papers at the Public

¹ *Ed. cit.*, II. 1385-8.

² Montchrétien uses a few details not given by Matthieu; he introduces, for instance, the character of Davison who announces the death sentence to Mary at the beginning of Act III. Davison is not mentioned in the *Histoire des derniers troubles*. The latter was, therefore, Montchrétien's chief, but not quite his only source.

Record Office¹. In 1610 a libellous book on King James I appeared in France. The English ambassador in Paris was instructed to endeavour to track the author; and King James himself suggested that Matthieu might possibly be the culprit because the style of the libel resembled that of the historian and also because 'he (Matthieu) hath been ghirding at this State before.' It transpired, however, that one Rebout was the real author of the libel. Matthieu had a serious conversation with the ambassador, in the course of which it was explained to him that 'for the partialities which we had observed he had shewed against the State of England, in his *Storie*, his pen, which was formerly accused by us, was the more suspected upon the coming forth of this lewed booke,' and was then dismissed with a warning. Matthieu had written various other historical works, so the rather vague expression 'his *Storie*' may or may not refer to the *Histoire des derniers troubles*. But it is a rather curious coincidence that the author of what we believe to be the source of *L'Écossaise* should also have come into conflict with the English authorities.

This discussion as to the source of *L'Écossaise* has led us somewhat from our original enquiry, which was to discover what it was that the English ambassadors objected to in the play. One might have thought that a poem which glorified the memory of James's mother whilst palliating the part played in the affair by Elizabeth would have met with their approval. But no doubt the truth of the matter is that the disapprobation of the English ambassadors did not rest upon fine distinctions of this kind, but upon a general principle which was gradually being formulated in England, the basis of which was that any representation on the stage of a 'modern Christian king' was, in itself, unseemly². In their horror at hearing that the characters of Queen Elizabeth and Queen Mary were being presented on a public stage, they would not stop to consider the matter or the argument of the play.

But a French contemporary did ponder the argument of *L'Écossaise* and seems to have seen in it a dangerous attempt at arousing again the old popular passion for the Guise family, a stirring up, as it were, of the embers of the League.

I base the above statement upon my interpretation of *Le Triomphe de la Ligue*, a play by R. J. Nerée, published in 1607, which I believe the author intended as an answer to *L'Écossaise*. In order to support this

¹ P.R.O. State Papers, Foreign, France, 56. The Matthieu incident is related in the following (unpublished) letters: Salisbury to Edmondess, 16 Oct. 1610, and 27 Oct. 1610; Edmondess to Salisbury, 2 and 3 Nov. 1610.

² See E. K. Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, I, pp. 322-8.

claim I shall be obliged to give a short résumé of the argument of the play.

Its central theme is the painful story—then still very fresh in the minds of Frenchmen—of the religious wars of the preceding century, the bitter struggle between Catholics and Huguenots. The first act begins with a long monologue deploring the unhappy state of France, spoken by a personage entitled 'Constance garde-loix' who afterwards turns out to represent the Reformed Religion. Then 'Giesu' (Guise), 'Numiade' (Du Maine, i.e., Mayenne), and 'Jeusoie' (Joyeuse) appear upon the scene. The Guises are here represented as ambitious self-seekers who have fomented civil wars and ruined France to further their private ends—namely the seizure of the crown of France for their own family. François II and Charles IX were their tools, but the third brother, Henri III, has proved less tractable. To crush him they have formed, with the help of Spain, the Catholic League; they have deluded the people into supporting this with empty promises. Henry of Navarre is the hero who contrasts with these villains, although he never appears in person. The Guises regard him as their most dangerous enemy, first, because he is the legitimate heir to the throne which they had hoped to seize for themselves, and secondly because his valour and personal charm have made him extremely popular. The author of this play is himself a Protestant; but he bears no grudge against Catholics who will accept Henry of Navarre as king, that is to say Catholics who are not Leaguers. He belongs, in short, to that body of 'politique' opinion which found its chief expression in the *Satire Ménippée* and which did so much to place Henri IV firmly on the throne of France.

This general presentation of the situation occupies the first three acts. In the last two we learn, through the mouths of various messengers, of the successive blows which fell upon the House of Guise and the League. First of all—and this is the most significant part of the play from our point of view—a Jesuit, just returned from England, imparts to Guise the news of the death of the Queen of Scots. The Duke is enraged at this affront to his family, and realises at once what a set-back this will be to his ambitious schemes. The next piece of bad news Guise receives is the intelligence of Henry of Navarre's victory at the Battle of Coutras. And then comes a third great blow, the news of the ruin of the Spanish Armada, for the fortunes of the League are bound up with those of Spain. One feels that the object of the author is to demonstrate the intimate connexion between events in France and events in England; between the League, the tool used by Spain to destroy France, and

Mary, Queen of Scots, the centre of Spanish intrigue against England; between the Duke of Guise, who hoped to oust the legitimate kings of France, and Mary of Scotland—whose maiden name was Mary of Guise—whom her supporters hoped to place upon the throne of England.

The last scene of the fifth act is devoted to the description of Guise's assassination which, of course, is excused on the grounds that the Duke was plotting to murder the king and seize the crown.

It is easy to see how the argument of this play refutes Montchrétien. By putting the death of Mary into its historical context, Nerée demonstrates that the Frenchman who sympathises with that unhappy queen, must, if he is logical, be still an adherent of the League and a traitor to His Majesty King Henri IV. The plots in England against Elizabeth, of which Mary was the centre, had the same Spanish origin as the plots in France against the legitimate French sovereigns. This is made quite clear, and great stress is laid on the fact that the execution of the Queen of Scots was a blow to Guise and to the League.

The proof that Nerée really did intend this play to be an answer to Montchrétien's is the fact that the speeches of 'Visteie' (i.e., 'Jesuite') are verbally reminiscent of *L'Écossaise*. In order to support this claim I shall be obliged to quote at some length. It will be remembered that in the final chorus of *L'Écossaise*¹, Montchrétien enumerates the charms of Mary—her eyes, her forehead, her hair, etc.—and concludes that everything in life must be transitory indeed since such beauties have already faded into nothingness. Bearing this passage in mind it is interesting to read the following oration made by the Jesuit in Act iv, Sc. i of *Le Triomphe de la Ligue*:

Ô grandeurs qu'on adore,
Patronnés vous ici, veu ce front dont l'aurore
Empruntoit la splendeur, ces yeux rians et doux
Ains ses brillants souleils, qui d'Apollon jaloux
Ternissoient les rayons, cest amoureux Chef mesmes
Qui s'est veu honorer de deux grands diademes,
Leur beau lustre eclipser par la meurtrière main
D'un infame bourreau, ô supplice inhumain!
Puis allez vous fier aux blandices du monde,
Aux trompeuses faveurs, malheureux qui s'y fonde....

The whole passage is an obvious and not unskilful imitation of Montchrétien's style.

The Jesuit also tells us that Mary prayed for the League with her last breath:

Aidez au moins la Ligue, et prenez la défense
Du parti commencé dès que j'estois en France.

¹ *Ed. cit.*, ll. 1539-610.

And it must be admitted that Montchrétien had put a similar sentiment, though couched in much vaguer terms, into the mouth of the Queen of Scots. In the long 'farewell' speech in *L'Écossaise*, Mary thus apostrophises her relations the Guises:

Adieu braues Lorrains, qui de Lauriers couuers,
Faites que vostre Race en tous lieux estimée,
Vante encor' à bon droit les palmes d'Idumée¹.

It will be noticed that Nerée replies to the argument of the last three acts of *L'Écossaise* and evidently considers that they, and not the first two, contain Montchrétien's real opinion. He also strongly attacks the statement that it was a sin to put to death a person of royal blood. In the chorus which immediately precedes the scene between Guise and the Jesuit, Nerée puts forward his views on this subject in no uncertain terms. The power of kings is indeed, he says, divinely ordained, and in that sense they are sacred. But if they provoke God to anger they forfeit all immunity from punishment. Let all wicked princes come now and behold the terrible fate that has recently overtaken a queen!

Voiez, voiez ceste fois,
Froids de peur, rouges de honte,
La Roine des Escossois
Qu'un desastre estrange dompte:
Apprenez par ses douleurs,
Qu'en ces bas lieux ou nous sommes,
Vous n'estes rien que des hommes
Subjects a mesmes malheurs.

The words which I have italicised are surely a final proof that Nerée had Montchrétien in mind. They are, I believe, an allusion to the titles of the latter's play, which in the first edition was called *L'Escossoise ou le Desastre*, and in the second, *La Tragedie de la Reine D'Escosse*.

It has also occurred to me that the dedication of the *Triomphe de la Ligue* to 'Samuel Korecky, Comte de Korec'—obviously a made-up name—may also be aimed at Montchrétien, whose high-sounding title of 'Seigneur de Vasteville' was of rather doubtful authenticity, or so his enemies hinted.

It would be interesting to identify the author of *Le Triomphe de la Ligue*. Beauchamps² attributes it, curiously enough, to that same Pierre Matthieu who wrote the *Histoire des derniers troubles*. But Beauchamps has confused *Le Triomphe de la Ligue* with Matthieu's play *La Guisiade*. Paul Lacroix suggests Nicholas Rapin, one of the principal authors of the *Satire Ménippée*. He says, 'Le style (du *Triomphe de la Ligue*) a

¹ *Ed. cit.*, ll. 1242-4.

² Godart de Beauchamps, *Recherches sur les théâtres de France*, II, pp. 10-11.

beaucoup d'analogie avec celui de Rapin, qui fut mandé à la cour l'année même de la publication de cette pièce...¹. If this hypothesis should be correct, the play would take on an additional importance as an official reply to *L'Écossaise*, sanctioned—possibly even ordered—by Henri IV himself.

It would appear, then, that Montchrétien's play, since it called forth the ire of Winwood and Parry and elicited a reply from Nerée, must have been something of a storm centre in the early years of the seventeenth century. And yet one feels that it was primarily as a poet and as a man of sentiment, rather than as a politician, that he was first attracted to the story of the beautiful and ill-fated Queen of Scots. Montchrétien always seems to have had a genius for getting into difficulties, and I leave it to others to follow up the clue to some of his difficulties which the facts related above would seem to suggest.

FRANCES A. YATES.

CLAYGATE, SURREY.

¹ *Bibliothèque dramatique de M. de Soleinne*. Catalogue rédigé par P. L. Jacob (Paul Lacroix), 1843-5, No. 920.

THE MAID OF ORLEANS IN GERMAN LITERATURE

AN enormous mass of theological, historical and imaginative literature has grown up round Jeanne d'Arc. The French contribution is naturally the largest; the British comes second and the German third¹. It is with the last-mentioned, as far as it is reflected in imaginative literature, that the present paper is concerned.

Jeanne d'Arc was not long in becoming known in Germany. As early as 1429 the following entry appears in the accounts of the city of Regensburg: 'Item mehr haben wir gebe von dem Gemael zu schau'n wie die Junckfraw zu Frankreich gefochten hat 24 pfennig.' From the same year are two letters on her achievements written by Germans in France; a Latin work, six *Propositiones pro Puella* and six *contra Puellam*, written by Heinrich von Gorkum (Gorikeim), professor in Cologne, in which he concludes that the evidence is insufficient to decide the nature of her inspiration; and *Sibylla Francica*, two papers in Latin on witchcraft, magic, etc. with special reference to Jeanne d'Arc². Further, Eberhard Windecke (ca. 1380-1442) has a long reference to her deeds in his account of the age of Emperor Sigmund³.

The Maid appears to have figured in a lost play produced at Regensburg in 1430; and in the sixteenth century Eustasche von Knobelsdorf, a Prussian humanist, wrote a Latin poem in which he compared her to Camilla, Penthesilea, Judith, and other heroines of ancient times. Jeanne then disappears from German literature for two centuries, until Johann Gottfried Bernhold made her the subject of a five-act tragedy in alexandrines⁴. As this play, *La Pucelle d'Orléans oder Johanna, die Heldin von Orleans* (Nürnberg, 1752), appears to have escaped the notice of all writers on Schiller and his predecessors, I deal with it at some length.

¹ Cp. Pierre Lanéry d'Arc, *Le Livre d'Or de Jeanne d'Arc*, Paris, 1894; Ulysse Chevalier, *Jeanne d'Arc, Bibliographie*, Paris, 1905. For English works see A. Haudecœur, *Jeanne d'Arc dans la littérature et devant l'opinion en Angleterre* (*Travaux de l'Académie de Rheims*, xcv, Rheims, 1895). This was copied without either alterations of importance or acknowledgement by James Darmester, *Jeanne d'Arc en Angleterre, Nouvelles études anglaises*, Paris, 1896. The best account of what has been written in Germany is G. Goyau, *Jeanne d'Arc devant l'opinion allemande*, Paris, 1907; the title of Bloy's *Jeanne d'Arc et l'Allemagne*, Paris, 1915, a 'war book,' is misleading. Lorenzi di Bradi, *Jeanne d'Arc dans la littérature anglaise*, Paris, 1921, is of no value.

² See for these references Quicherat, *Procès de condamnation et de réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc*, Paris, 1841, and Goyau, *op. cit.*

³ W. Altmann, *Eberhard Windeckes Denkwürdigkeiten zur Geschichte des Zeitalters Kaiser Sigmunds*, herausg., Berlin, 1893, pp. 245-60; 518-22.

⁴ Johann G. Bernhold (1720-66) became professor and rector of the University of Altdorf. He wrote another play, *Irene*, and translated Thomson's *Sophonisba*.

Bernhold's attention had been drawn to Jeanne d'Arc by Voltaire's *Pucelle*, which he quotes in his fourteen-page preface, and he made a study of the various accounts of her career before giving his own interpretation of her character.

Had Jeanne been a man, Bernhold writes, she would have been unquestioningly accepted as a great hero, but as she was a woman, people have not merely praised her extravagantly, but have sought out the weak points in her character and invented others. Both her friends and her foes have gone to extremes, and have allowed themselves to be misled by 'Vorurtheilen, der Zeiten Blindheit, Superstition oder Aberglauben.' It was foolish to believe her to have had intercourse with the Archangel Michael, for God is well known to have renounced such direct communication with mankind centuries ago. He rejects the suggestion that she was a witch, because even if such creatures exist at all, God would never have permitted one to win battles and crown a king, 'denn dieses ist Gottes Werck.' She was no mere fanatic, for such persons have rarely been virtuous as Jeanne was, and have seldom or never accomplished big things, unless their 'Schwärmerey' was a cloak for 'Bosheit, Arglist, vorsetzlicher Betrug, Eigennutz und dergleichen,' and they established sects as did 'Mahomet, Cromvvell and Zinzendorf.' The fact that she bore arms and carried a banner does not prove her to have been a fanatic. She did that merely to catch the people's eye; it was 'eine erlaubte Betrügerey oder eine bessere List.' She was no more blameworthy for doing this than Numa Pompilius was for pretending to have received his laws direct from the Nymph Egeria. Bernhold cannot accept the view that Jeanne was a puppet in the hands of some statesman or general for she could never have played a part so long. He considers she was divinely inspired but that the details of the operations were worked out by the Bastard and other commanders. God gave her power to accomplish her mission but He left her her freedom of will, as He does all mankind. She could be divinely inspired without being free from the usual feminine weaknesses of vanity, love and quibbling. Bernhold points out that God chose ordinary sinful men to be judges and deliverers of Israel: Jephtha who made a rash vow, Samson who sinned and was punished. He sent the English to punish France and themselves, and Jeanne to punish the English and herself.

The first four acts of the play are laid in the King's chamber in the palace at Compiègne. The play begins with the return of Jeanne and her brother Louis to the army; after the coronation she had left but could not keep away from the fighting. Brother and sister give a brief summary

of the history of the wars between England and France from Edward III's time onwards; to which Bernhold obligingly adds footnotes. Johanna is received with great demonstrations of affection and respect. Charles even kneels to her. Flauī, a captain, falls in love with her; she has, however, already explained to d'Olon ('Vertraute der Pucelle') that she admires Dunois for his bravery, and that flattery and voluptuousness will never win love from her: 'Kein frecher Wollust-Reiz bringt mir das Lieben bey!' The favour shown to her by the King arouses the jealousy of Flauī.

The second act centres round Jaques d'Arc, father of the Maid. He had escaped from a Burgundian prison, where he had lain for eight years. He had made his way to Domremy and claimed his farm, but no one had recognised him and he was accused of trying to buy land cheap. He had learned that his daughter was the national heroine, so fled to her for protection. There is a conventional recognition scene; the King ennobles him against his will and gives him a suit of knightly clothes. He would rather be a simple farmer again and he begs the King to send him and Johanna home, as he feels a foreboding of disaster. Johanna joins her prayers to his, for she knows she has fulfilled her mission:

Johanna. Dein Kummer macht mir bang und schröckt die kühne Brust.
Es ist mir mein Beruf, wie weit er gieng, bewust.
Ich sollte Orleans, das Reich, dich, König! retten,
Und deiner Majestät das Purpur Lager betten.
Ich hab es auch gethan. Rheims, Cron und Zepter lehrt,
Dass mir, die dich geführt, der Himmel Glück beschehrt.
Mein schwacher Arm konnt mehr, als alle Helden, zwingen;
Der Feinde siegreichs Heer in Furcht und Schrecken bringen.
Allein, nun spühr ich selbst, ich hätte gnug gethan.
Schier treibt mein weiblichs Herz ein schüchterns Wesen an:
Ich sollte—

Carl. Was dann thun?

Johanna. Dich jetzt gewarnt verlassen,
Mein König! und den Stand, von dem ich kam, umfassen.
Der Vater wünscht es so: der Himmel winckt mir zu.
Herr! gönne Ihm und mir, Wunsch, Sicherheit und Ruh!

(Act II, Sc. iv.)

The King however represents himself as utterly dependent on her aid, which flatters Johanna's vanity so much that she exclaims:

Mein König! deinem Wort, kann ich nicht widerstehn;
Ich will, wann es dein Wunsch, in Flut und Flammen gehn...
Nun flammt das vorge Feuer die Seel und Geister an.

Death in her country's service would be a joy. Jaques is not convinced, and Johanna reproaches him: 'Das deinen niedern Sinn, mein Beyspiel nicht erhebt!' In the end he reluctantly consents, because it is his heroic daughter's wish and the King's command, although he had felt

more at ease in prison. As he had heard nothing about the war during his long imprisonment, d'Olon gives him an appropriately lengthy account of all Johanna's achievements. He puts on his new clothes, and now feels so much of a knight that he insists on riding out to battle with Johanna. The old man's vanity, which is his undoing, is deeply tragic, although outwardly comic.

In the third act Flauì declares his love, and learns that Dunois is preferred. Mad with jealousy of Dunois and of the high honours conferred on Johanna by the King, he tries to get La Hire to join him in a plot to ruin her. La Hire rebukes him for his treasonable thoughts, although he has to admit that it is presumptuous in one of Johanna's low birth to love Dunois. Flauì however means to cause her defeat, which he does in the next act. We learn later that he only meant her to be captured in order that he might rescue her with the aid of a fresh army which he had secretly arranged that Vendome should bring. Louis, Johanna's brother, and La Hire stab him mortally, but he repents, and is reconciled to them before his death.

The fifth act takes place in the Duke of Bedford's tent. Johanna is a prisoner, Bedford tells her that Cauchon and other learned men have declared her to merit burning as a witch, and that he intends to carry out the sentence. They argue the matter at length and with considerable heat. Suddenly the alarm is given that Dunois has stormed the ramparts and the camp is in his hands. Bedford stabs Johanna, who falls with the cry 'Tyrann.' Bedford goes out sword in hand to sell his life as dearly as possible. Dunois finds Johanna dying. They declare their love, and Johanna begs him to do the last service for her by closing her eyes. He does so before she dies:

(Nachdem Ihr Dunois die Augen zgedruckt spricht sie ganz entzückt)

O allerhöchste Lust! Ich seh' den Himmel offen!

Nun hab' ich alles schon, was andere nur noch hoffen! (stirbt).

Dunois, La Hire and the King swear vengeance on Bedford and the English.

Bernhold's *Johanna* is genuinely dramatic, as the tragedy arises out of the characters of the persons represented. Johanna is vain and rash, the King is selfish and dependent, Flauì is jealous, over-ambitious and mean. These faults, which render the tragedy inevitable, are not exaggerated. Bernhold has drawn real human beings, not a series of caricatures. There is nothing romantic or mystical about the heroine's fall. It was her human vanity which caused her to make the fatal assault on Compiègne against the advice of the King and Dunois, and this played

into the hands of those who resented being cast into the shade by her successes. In spite of the stilted language, obsolete technique and other drawbacks inseparable from a play of its date, Bernhold's *Johanna* is strangely modern.

Another half-century passed, and with it, the age of Enlightenment. Bernhold's *Johanna*, rationalised as far as the author's Catholicism would allow, gave way to the Romantic 'Jungfrau' created by Schiller as a retort to Voltaire and as a patriotic appeal to his countrymen. The necessity for the unhistorical close of *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* is clearly demonstrated by the later plays of which Jeanne d'Arc is the heroine. The career of the historical Jeanne provides material for three dramas, the first terminating at her recantation, the second showing her subsequent imprisonment, relapse, and execution, the third or Epilogue having as its subject the completion of her life's work and her posthumous glory. The later plays, which keep more or less closely to historical facts, fail because the tragedy does not sweep straight on, but is interrupted by the pardon, and finally annulled by the events which take place after the death of the heroine. Even Schiller does not entirely escape the latter reproach. It would also have been contrary to Schiller's purpose to show patriotic devotion shamefully deserted by those whom it had loyally served.

After Schiller had drawn attention to her, poets, historians and theologians vied with one another in paying tribute to the Maid. Mention may be made of Friedrich Schlegel's compilation, *Geschichte der Jungfrau von Orleans aus alten französischen Quellen*, Berlin, 1802; Fouqué's adaptation of Lebrun des Charmettes' *Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc*, Berlin, 1826; and Guido Görres' *Die Jungfrau von Orleans nach den Processakten und gleichzeitigen Chroniken*, Regensburg, 1834. A more recent book, Hermann Semmig's *Die Jungfrau von Orleans und ihre Zeitgenossen*, Leipzig, 1885, has a particular interest as it anticipates Mr Shaw's theory that Jeanne was a Protestant.

Schiller's *Jungfrau von Orleans* did not meet with universal approval. Platen wrote:

Etwas weniger, Freund, Liebschaften! so wärest du beliebt zwar
Weniger, weil ja so sehr Thekla gefallen und Max:
Eins doch find' ich zu stark, dass selbst die begeisterte Jungfrau
Noch sich verliebt furchtbar schnell in den britischen Lord.

And in 1803 Julius von Voss produced a two-act farce, *Die travestirte Johanna*. This piece makes no pretence to artistic merit or historical accuracy. Its wild exaggerations are often amusing, and it contains a

certain amount of clumsy satire on contemporary men of letters, on the artificial manners of the aristocracy, and on the amateurishness of the army, of which Voss had first-hand knowledge. His *Johanna* is a burlesque of the calumnies levelled at her by the chroniclers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, who represented her as a hoyden of doubtful virtue. He describes her as 'eine amazonirte Viehmagd, furienwild aber schön.'

The first of the minor Romanticists to produce a rival *Jungfrau* was Friedrich Gottlob Wetzel¹. Wetzel conceived the plan of his *Jeanne d'Arc* in 1814, during a sleepless night when he was suffering from congestion of the lungs, and he wrote the play during his convalescence. It is obviously the work of a very sick man who could not control his pen. There are a number of good ideas in his drama, but Wetzel could not give them life. Nevertheless his *Jeanne d'Arc* is by no means to be despised. Jean Paul found points to admire, Goethe sent a complimentary letter through Knebel, and Otto Ebstein, *Unterhaltungsbeilage der tgl. Rundschau* 29. Juli 1925, calls it 'durchaus kein Epigonenstck, sondern eine Dichtung von Eigenart, die sich sehr wohl zwischen Schiller und Shaw halten kann.'

This is true of his conception of his heroine. He introduces no love-story and *Johanna's* fall is due to the fact that she has allowed herself to be persuaded by the King to exceed her mission. When she was given command of the army at the beginning, she stipulated for a written guarantee that she should be allowed to return to Domremy as soon as the Dauphin had been crowned in Rheims. But the King would not keep his promise, having sworn a solemn oath not to let her go as long as an English soldier remained on French soil. *Jeanne* and the arch-

¹ Friedrich Gottlob Wetzel (1779-1819), summarily dismissed by Goyau as 'un publiciste bava­rois fort oubli,' was brought to light by Franz Schultz in his *Der Verfasser der Nachtwachen von Bonaventura*, Berlin, 1909. Schultz' suggestion that Wetzel was the author of the *Nachtwachen* appears to have met with fairly general acceptance (cp. Meyer, *Euphorion*, xvi (1909), pp. 797 ff.). Schultz gives a short account of Wetzel's career and a list of his writings, to which I would add an essay printed in Z. Funck's *Kurze Geschichte des Buchs Sarsena oder der vollkommene Baumeister nebst einem MS. F. G. Wetzels*, Bamberg, 1893. For details of his life we are dependent on the biography written by his friend and literary executor C. F. Kunz under the pseudonym of Z. Funck: *Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben in biographischen Denksteinen und anderen Mittheilungen*, Leipzig, 1836. Sebastian Merckle, *F. G. Wetzel, Arzt, Dichter und Tagesschriftsteller 1779-1819 (Verffentlichungen der Gesellschaft fr frnkische Geschichte*, vii, 1922, pp. 488 ff.), gives a useful list of the fairly extensive literature which has grown up about him since 1909. In addition to his *Jeanne d'Arc*, *Trauerspiel in fnf Aufzgen*, Leipzig and Altenburg, 1817, Wetzel wrote a good deal of patriotic verse, which has been collected by Funck: *Wetzel's Gesammelte Schriften und Nachlass*, Leipzig, 1838. The *Bayrisches Volkslied* zum 18. Okt. is written to the tune of *God save the King*. He also wrote a tragedy, *Hermannfried, letzter Knig von Thringen*, Berlin, 1818, a polemic against the French and a satire on German treachery, disunion, love of titles and worship of all things foreign. This play has no artistic value; it is merely a series of echoes of *Macbeth*, *Wallenstein*, *Kabale und Liebe*, etc.

bishop feel that this will bring disaster. Almost the same motive, coupled with female vanity, is to be found in Bernhold's drama; but Wetzel has not entirely escaped the influence of Schiller's superwoman: his heroine has no such weakness.

The most notable feature of the play, however, is the atmosphere of foreboding which pervades it. Johanna induces de Baudricourt to permit her to go to seek the Dauphin by foretelling a battle eight days before he receives the news (Act I, Sc. ii); Talbot has twice a foreboding of his own death; and the English sentinels are uneasy just before the capture of Johanna. In the seventh scene of the fifth act Wetzel narrowly fails to rise to real greatness. We are informed by a young peasant, who thinks Johanna will have forgotten her humble friends, that Jaques d'Arc, having a presentiment that his daughter is in danger, had gone to hear mass and pray for her. We know that while the old man is praying, Johanna is being led to the stake. Wetzel's powers were not equal to developing this tragic situation. But with all its faults and occasional absurdities, his *Jeanne d'Arc* has the makings of a successful play. The characters are clearly drawn and are, with the exception of the exaggeratedly unscrupulous villain Cauchon, individual and real.

Another fifty years passed before Jeanne was again made the subject of a German drama. This time she was treated as an example of uncompromising loyalty to one's King by one Wilhelm von Ining of Cassel. His *Johanna d'Arc* (Cassel, 1868) is written in an abominable prose, every third line of which contains a concealed iambic verse; but notwithstanding, it is a remarkable piece of work. The capture of Johanna is brought about in a highly novel way. A rascally French courtier named St Foix (copied from Iago) who has lost his influence over the King through Johanna, arranges to betray her to Lionel. The latter and the other English officers accept his proposal, but most unwillingly, only duty compelling them to sacrifice their honour. While the King is celebrating his coronation like Hamlet's uncle with wine and the firing of salvoes, Johanna and de Baudricourt, who is an elderly man, wander away from the town, the beauty of the moonlit forest being more to their taste than the garish splendour of the palace. De Baudricourt declares his love for Johanna. She loves him too, but repulses him from a sense of duty. At this moment Lionel and the other English officers appear. Johanna, having left her sword behind, cannot resist; de Baudricourt is killed by Lionel after a brief struggle, and Johanna sinks down despairingly beside him crying 'Dahin! Nimm mich mit Dir!'

As Cauchon reads the judgment on Johanna in the second act, the

lay judges make signs of protest, but dare not persist when Beaupère threatens them with excommunication. Cauchon, notwithstanding Beaupère's impatience, urges Johanna to repent, but she reviles the court as corrupt and resolved to murder her. In spite of Beaupère, Cauchon insists on her having her say. The mob in the galleries yells for her death, the clerical assessors throng round Cauchon, but he remains unperturbed. Johanna faints in terror at the prospect of death in the flames. 'Ich bin am Ziel,' says Cauchon, 'Wiederruf ist mehr als Tod.' She signs a confession, under promise of release after a short imprisonment: 'Milde Haft, dann Freiheit, Domremy!' Cauchon then reads the confession which includes: 'Schuldig des Verrats an meinem guten König Heinrich, vollführt zu Lieb und Gunsten des Dauphin Karl, der sich fälschlich König nennt.' With a cry of 'Lügner' Johanna tears the paper. The mob bursts into the court desiring to lynch her and threatens Cauchon, but he dominates them all by the force of his personality and by his office. Johanna again denounces the court and then marches out voluntarily to the stake: 'Kommt! dahin, wo Henker mich umbringen, wo Flammen mich verzehren—wo meine Seele aufwärts fliegt.' Cauchon, unmoved, solemnly commits her to the secular judges: 'Kraft unseres Amtes übergeben wir Euch den Leib der Sünderin Johanna d'Arc. Tödtet ihn, bevor die Sonne untergeht.' Talbot would fain save Johanna, if he could, for he is sceptical about the responsibility of the Devil for her actions. In the next and closing scene he visits her in prison and tries to get her to renounce Charles. For a moment he contemplates rescuing her by force of arms, but duty forbids. He cannot commit treason for her, and Johanna will not deny her King. Johanna is led forth to death. The bells of Rouen are heard followed by soft music. The prison disappears. The Blessed Virgin appears aloft surrounded by angels, and a moment later Johanna rises to be clasped in her arms.

The historical inaccuracies in Schiller's *Jungfrau von Orleans* were a great trouble to the German conscience; and the more modern dramatists sought to avoid them. In his *Johanna Darc* (Ulm, 1871) Adolf Wechssler provides a 'Vorbemerkung, welche bei einer Aufführung im Theaterzettel anzubringen ist,' in which he professes to have drawn his materials from the documents relating to the condemnation and rehabilitation. This claim must be admitted with regard to the trial at least. His historical accuracy, however, has choked the play, which is very long, owing to the mass of historical detail with which it is encumbered. There is no inevitability about the action. We have simply a dramatised chronicle of Johanna's career. Nevertheless it could doubtless be

successfully performed, if vigorously cut, for it contains plenty of effective scenes, including several battles with accompanying artillery fire, two hand-to-hand encounters between Johanna and Talbot, and the burning of the heroine on the stage.

Johanna is conceived as a slightly-built and gentle-natured girl, whose strength is derived entirely from Divine support. At one moment she is fighting like a tigress, at another she is a child calling La Hire 'Vater Étienne,' or being called 'Du sonderbares Kind,' 'Du liebe kleine Heilige,' 'das hübsche Kind' by his wife. When not in action, she is essentially feminine. We see her sewing, but she lays down her needle with most impressive calmness to smite her presumptuous squire. A much stronger dramatic genius than Wechssler's would be required to make the two Johannas credible in this sceptical age.

Albert Kühne likewise wrote his *Mädchen von Orleans* (Leipzig, 1890) in order to give a correct historical representation of Jeanne d'Arc in opposition to Schiller's romantic conception. His claim to historical accuracy is justified, particularly with regard to the trial, which proceeds in two scenes occupying twelve printed pages in all, followed by the recantation and her recommittal to prison in a third scene of two pages, laid in the market place of Rouen. Kühne truly asserts in his preface that he has used Jeanne's own words to a large extent. Kühne attributes no guilt to his Johanna: 'Ihre Schuld ist—ihre Unschuld, jene rührende Hingebung an den Träger der Krone und die Lehren der Kirche, von denen jener sie im Stiche lässt, diese sie perfide ihren Feinden zur Vernichtung preisgibt.' She was betrayed by La Trimouille and the Archbishop of Rheims out of jealousy and the King lacked resolution to support her. Kühne's Johanna, like Wechssler's, is a tender maiden. We hear of her leading the assaults, but we do not see her fighting. There are no violent battles on the stage, and the burning proceeds behind the scenes. We see a red glow for a moment and hear Johanna's cry of 'Jesus! Jesus! Jesus!' Kühne sets out to recount all the significant incidents in Jeanne's career, but he informs the audience of much more than he lets them see. The form of the epic would have suited his purpose better than the drama. In language and metre he is completely dominated by Schiller's influence, and many of his ideas come from Schiller's plays. There is even a sermon by a Franciscan in imitation of the 'Kapuzinerpredigt' in *Wallensteins Lager*.

Whenever a Frenchman calumniates the Maid, a German steps forward in her defence, writes Goyau. Anatole France's sceptical life was followed by George Terramare's *Die Magd von Domremy* (Munich,

1925). This long novel contains most of the incidents in the life of the Maid from her childhood to her death, as collected from the various original sources by earlier investigators such as Anatole France and Andrew Lang. Terramare has added nothing to the outline of the picture, but he has inserted detail and filled in the colours to suit his own purpose, which was to show how God may use a humble instrument to achieve His own great purposes and to manifest the power which Faith lends.

Terramare is a loyal Catholic. To him Jeanne's powers are genuinely miraculous and her visions real, but he does not thrust the miraculous down our throats as is done, for example, by Seeböck in his *Die ehrwürdige Johanna d'Arc* (Dulmen, 1897). Terramare does not preach. He endeavours with considerable success to create an atmosphere in which the miraculous events appear natural and inevitable, even to the sceptical twentieth century. When the miracle is due, it is introduced quietly and unostentatiously. The guiding hand of God is not violently brandished in our faces, but moves firmly behind the scenes. On the same principle, the villains of the piece, Cauchon, La Trimouille, etc. have been softened down to suit modern tastes. They are still unscrupulous and treacherous, but they are not abandoned reprobates. Their fault is really that they trust too much to human wisdom and too little in the Lord.

Die Magd von Domremy is one of the important literary works on Jeanne d'Arc. As the offering of Catholic piety, it is worthy to stand beside the romantic idealisation of Schiller, the scepticism of France, and the rationalism of Mr Shaw.

Georg Kaiser's *Gilles und Jeanne* (Potsdam, 1923) is in a certain sense a return to Schiller. This time it is the titanic Gilles de Rais who falls in love with the heroine, not with a romantic affection indeed, but with the desire of a mighty spirit to unite with another that it recognises as its equal in a world of pygmies. Gilles de Rais¹ raises an army and wins a battle for Jeanne's sake, then demands and begs for her love, but is scornfully repulsed, because Jeanne's mission does not admit of love, and because she gives God, not Gilles, the glory of the victory. In the second battle he keeps his troops inactive. Jeanne pleads and threatens in vain; he is indifferent to everything but her. Gilles leaves Jeanne to her fate.

She is tried before a cardinal and some bishops on a charge of associating with evil spirits. Three English officers testify in her favour, and the

¹ Cp. H. Semmig, *op. cit.*

cardinal is on the point of acquitting her, when Gilles de Rais appears. It is his last attempt to bend her to his will, and he hints that he will give evidence against her, unless she yields. She ignores him, and he declares that during the second battle he saw her bargaining with Satan himself. The cardinal covers his eyes with his hand. Jeanne stands in ecstasy. Gilles gazes at her wide-eyed. She is sentenced, and at once taken away to the stake. Gilles has played his last card and lost.

Gilles tries to get Jeanne back by supernatural means. He promises his alchemist all the materials needed for the manufacture of gold, if he will produce Jeanne. The alchemist endeavours to palm off on him a series of village girls dressed up as Jeanne, but Gilles discovers the trick and murders them. This eventually comes to light, and Gilles is tried for murder and magic before the Nuncio and the cardinals. He obstinately denies his guilt, but the evidence is too strong. Suddenly the King, who is a spectator at the trial, accuses him of having been in love with Jeanne; and of wilfully losing the second battle for this reason:

Der König: Soll ich reden?—Das ist die Historie vom Einfall der Engländer in Frankreich. Die Vorgänge haben mich nie ruhen lassen. Etwas ist immer unaufgeklärt geblieben: was hat Gilles—ein Edelmann von Musse und Vermögen—Musse und Vermögen für mich zu opfern? Ich bin ein König—und überhaupt nicht beliebt. Ich bringe keine zehn Regimenter zusammen—Gilles stampft Armeen aus dem Boden. Meinetwegen? Ich ziehe gar nicht zu Feld—Jeanne kommandiert. Für Jeanne kauft er das Heer—immer reitet er bei Jeanne—das Bild lebt mir unauslöschlich: Gilles und Jeanne im Felde. Liebe ist das—das ist Liebe von einer Art, für die wir noch kein Verständnis aufbringen. Vielleicht sind wir zu schwach, so zu lieben—aber ich glaube an Möglichkeiten—die für den ganzen Gilles die Beleuchtung schaffen. Gilles liebt—liebt—liebt—Es hat eine Fortsetzung—da müsste man lange nachdenken! (*Er setzt sich—die Hand an der Stirn.*)

The cardinal who had sentenced Jeanne on Gilles' evidence collapses. Gilles still denies everything. The Nuncio is about to break the staff over him, when Jeanne is announced. She will not say whence she has come, for mankind is not ripe for the knowledge. She has heard nothing about the charge against Gilles. She is asked whether she recognises him and asks him whether he knows her. A blinding light illuminates Jeanne and Gilles, all the rest being invisible. She appears to him in her armour. He cannot make a sign. The light fades, and Jeanne tells the blinded Nuncio that Gilles does not know her, and disappears. Gilles is acquitted, but suddenly confesses all his murders, his false witness, and his love for Jeanne. He has found himself and saved himself. Jeanne has prevailed.

The play is packed with symbolism which need not be interpreted here, except where it relates to the two principal characters. We have

in *Gilles und Jeanne* Schiller's Johanna seen in the light of Goethe's words: 'Das Ewig-Weibliche zieht uns hinan.' Jeanne, the Unattainable and Incorruptible, purifies that craving for higher things, which lives in the breast of Gilles, from the dross of earthly ambition and earthly pleasure. Under her influence he becomes 'ein Erkennender.' Freyhan¹ holds that Jeanne raises Gilles by means of 'das Mysterium der Liebe.' That is true in the sense that she purges his love of the sensual element. She does not love herself. Her mission to liberate France from the foreigner was sublimated by contact with Gilles into a call to free mankind from its grosser self. Gilles de Rais is a symbol for the blind will to power and self-expression or self-assertion that is at the root of so much human misery. Jeanne symbolises the purifying force that is at work in the world and prevails by means of heroic self-sacrifice.

J. KNIGHT BOSTOCK.

HAMBURG.

¹ *Georg Kaisers Werk*, Berlin, 1925, p. 198.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

'BEOWULF,' ll. 1086-1088.

| | | |
|------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| | | (ac hig him gepingo budon) |
| 1086 | pæt hie him oðer flet | eal gerymdon |
| | healle ond heah-setl | pæt hie healfre geweald |
| | wið Eotena bearn | agan moston |

In my book *The Finn Episode in Beowulf* (Cambridge University Press, 1924; cited in the following under *F.E.B.*) I tried to demonstrate that the above passage must contain two offers made by Finn to the Danes, the first *pæt*-clause being an offer to exchange halls, the second an offer to share the 'remnant of disaster' (*wea-laf*) mentioned in l. 1084. This has been rejected recently by an American critic of my book (Kemp Malone, in *J.E.G.Ph.* xxv, pp. 114 ff.) in favour of the interpretation proposed by Heusler (*Anz. f. d. A.* xli, p. 32) who takes both *pæt*-clauses together as parts of a whole containing one offer of Finn's, namely, an offer to share his *hall* with the Danes. My dissociation of the contents of the two clauses was due to my taking *healle* in l. 1087 as accusative, with the consequence that I could not make sense of *healfre* by taking it to agree with *healle*, which led me to adopt the alternative of regarding it as in agreement with *wea-lafe* (see *F.E.B.*, p. 55). Heusler shows that by taking *healle* as genitive dependent on the preceding *flet* we are free to regard *healfre* as in agreement with *healle* and to combine both clauses in a single offer to share the hall.

I must admit that I had overlooked the alternative to taking *healle* as accusative, and also that my demonstration in *F.E.B.* is incomplete in so far as it does not deal with the possibility of taking *healle* as genitive. The explanation is that my instinctive persuasion, that the form of the word must be the accusative, was so strong as to blind me to the alternative; and, since my essay was completed in MS. before Heusler's explanation of the lines appeared in print, I had nothing, as I wrote, to call attention to my oversight. I believe, however, that I can now show that my subjective feeling on this point was correct, because it can be supported by solid, objective grounds.

The metrical group *healle ond heah-setl* is of a type which often occurs as first half-line in *Beowulf* and is characterised by the circumstance that the conjunction *ond* stands in the median dip and that there is also double alliteration. Now I find after close examination of the whole

poem that in this type of half-line *ond* always connects words or phrases which are syntactic parallels, e.g., two subjects of the same verb, two attributes of the same noun, two case-forms governed by the same word, and so on. It is only a rider to this rule that, when two substantives in the first half-line alliterate together and are connected by *ond*, then they are in the same case. If we apply this here, it follows that, since *heah-sell* is certainly accusative, then *healle* must also be accusative. The necessity that it should be so is, of course, not absolute; but since all other similar instances show obedience to the rule, it is clear we are faced by a strong, stylistic preference of the author's, based probably on a specific feeling for the requirements of the rhythmical, and, likely, also the melodic, unity of the half-line. Certainly, if we take *healle* as genitive there is a syntactical interruption ('Einschnitt') in the half-line, which in all other similar types of half-line is absent, and which therefore the author—for whatever reasons—probably avoided. This is quite sufficient to establish the *a priori* probability that *healle* is accusative, and that the whole phrase *healle ond heah-sell* is a description for a mansion of importance analogous to what we have in *bold ond brego-stol* (l. 2196).

It is therefore probable *a priori* that *healle* is in the accusative case. The same can however be said with equal truth about the reference of *healfre* to *healle* by agreement! But here we are met by the peculiar circumstance, that it is impossible to combine both these probabilities in one explanation. They become irreconcilable when we seek to apply them together, and the interpreter is forced therefore to discard one of them. Hence the primary difference between Heusler's explanation and mine, for he discards *a priori* probability as regards the case of *healle*, whereas I discard it as regards the reference of *healfre*. As far as proving our respective positions is concerned, each of us committed the same methodical sin of omission, i.e., neither of us tried to show which of the above-mentioned probabilities it is *better* to suppress in order to arrive at the most probable explanation. This is the omission I will now try to supply by comparing both explanations, Heusler's and mine, firstly from a formal point of view, and then from the point of view of content. I hope to show that my explanation is preferable from both points of view.

Firstly, as regards form: the only formal objection to my explanation is that it sacrifices *a priori* probability as regards *healfre*, and this is of course balanced by the fact that Heusler's explanation sacrifices the same probability with regard to *healle*. In addition to this, Heusler's explanation requires that the word *flet* should be understood in a meaning

which is not its ordinary meaning. The accredited meanings of *flet* are either 'the floor-space in a hall, dwelling,' or, as *pars pro toto*, 'the hall, dwelling itself.' Heusler must assume however that *flet* was also used to denote either of the two sections into which a hall was divided through its internal organisation for seating the occupants. Now, of course, either side of the hall, where the benches were ranged, *may* have been called a *flet*, and the distinction between the host's side and the guests' side *may* have been brought out by calling the guests' side *oðer flet*, just as the lesser of the two high-seats, that on the guests' side, was in O.N. termed *annat qndvegi*: all this is possible, but there is no evidence for it in O.E. texts apart from Heusler's interpretation of this passage. It amounts to this, that the *possible* alternative meanings of *oðer flet* are 'the other of two floors or halls' and 'the other of two divisions of a floor or hall,' but of these the first is fact accredited by good evidence, and the second is only hypothesis supported by analogy. Therefore, other things being equal, an explanation of this passage which takes *flet* in its ordinary meaning (as mine does) is more probable than one which requires it to have a hypothetical meaning (as Heusler's does).

Secondly, as regards the internal factors of content, which are not discussed by Heusler: I have shown in *F.E.B.* that not only is this passage formally ambiguous, but the situation to which it refers is also ambiguous in its implications. For the situation is as follows: The Danes have occupied Finn's hall and Finn is not able to re-establish himself in it by assault. Finn makes an offer to treat with the Danes, which is largely dependent on his desire to regain possession of his hall. Now, of course, he might attempt this through negotiation by offering to share occupation of the hall with the Danes who already hold it and cannot be expelled by a direct attack. That is a compromise which might well occur to him. But it is not the only possible form of compromise, there is an alternative. Instead of offering to share his hall (the assumption underlying Heusler's explanation) he might offer an exchange of halls (the assumption underlying my explanation). The question therefore is, whether it is more probable that in the circumstances of the given situation, Finn would offer the compromise of sharing his hall or exchanging it for another. My analysis of the situation, which need not be repeated here in all its details, shows that Finn would have stronger reasons to offer an exchange than to offer a share. For the compromise would have to allow for the interests of both parties. From the Danish point of view, sharing the hall would be unacceptable because it would

deprive them of the only guarantee of security which they possess, namely, holding for themselves a hall which they can defend against assault. But from Finn's own point of view it would be undesirable to share his hall with the Danes, because he must take measures to avoid as far as possible all chances of friction between his old Frisian retainers and the new Danish band whom he is taking into his service. He has in these circumstances just as good reason to reject the idea of two bodies of retainers in one hall as Brynhild has to dislike the notion of having *tvá konunga í einni holl* (*Volsungas*, Kap. 29, 121, ed. Ranisch). Probability therefore demands that the text should contain an offer to exchange halls rather than an offer to share a hall; because, if halls be exchanged, the Danes preserve a guarantee of security (cp. *F.E.B.*, pp. 53, 54) and Finn has the less reason to fear friction between them and the Frisians (cp. *F.E.B.*, p. 87).

There is another difference, not yet mentioned, between Heusler's explanation and mine, in that he takes *Eotena bearn* (l. 1088) to refer to the Frisians, not, as I do, to the Danes. This is, however, negligible as far as the argument above is concerned, for if, e.g., Heusler had taken *Eotena bearn* to refer to the Danes, the content of the whole, as he understands it, would still have been an offer made by the Frisians to share their hall with the Danes. Hence, since Heusler gives no detailed statement of his reasons for regarding the Eotens as Frisians and my reasons for the contrary assumption are fully stated in *F.E.B.*, I need not discuss this point here.

R. A. WILLIAMS.

BELFAST.

'THE WANDERER,' ll. 41-43.

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| pinceð him on mode | pæt he his mondryhten |
| clyppe and cysse, | and on cneo leege |
| honda and heafod. | |

These lines are illustrated by a passage in Snorri's *Óláfs Saga Helga* in the *Heimskringla* (ed. F. Jonsson, 1911, *Ól. Helg.*, ch. 102); cp. *Flateyjarbók* (1862, II, p. 181).

King Olaf, intervening in the troubled politics of the Orkneys, had divided the islands into three parts, and had assigned one part to Earl Thorfin, one to Earl Brusi, his brother, and had retained the third part, for the moment, in his own possession. He had moreover demanded that the two Earls should become reconciled with Thorkel Amundason, their brother's slayer. After the act of reconciliation, Earl Thorfinn

prepared to return to the Orkneys, but, when he was ready to set out, there suddenly appeared before him Thorkel Amundason, and laid his head on the Earl's knee, and bade him do with it what he would ('þar kom fyrir hann Þorkell Ámundason váveifliga ok lagði höfuð sitt í kné jarli ok bað hann þá gera af slíkt, er hann vildi'). The Earl told Thorkel to rise, since 'we are already reconciled men, according to the King's decree' ('vér erum áðr menn sáttir at konungsdómi'). Thorkel replied to the effect that he knew the Earl too well not to be aware that the Orkneys was no safe place for him without the Earl's authority, upon which Thorfinn offered to take him to the Orkneys in his service: 'You shall go with me to the Orkneys, and be with me and not part from me without my permission and leave, and be bound to defend my land and to perform all deeds which I desire performed, as long as we both live.' Thorkel said: 'That lies with you, Earl, as does all else where I am concerned' ('at þú skalt með mér fara í Orkneyar ok vera með mér ok skiljask eigi með mik, nema mitt lof eða leyfi sé til; vera skyldr at verja land mitt ok allra verka þeira, er ek vil gera láta, meðan vit erum báðir á lífi.' Þorkell segir: 'þat skal á yðru valdi, jarl, sem allt annat, þat er ek má ráða').

Allowing for the particular circumstances of the saga episode, where the laying of the head on the knee is especially appropriate, since Thorkel's head may be considered as forfeit for the slaying of the Earl's brother, the passage still serves to support the view that the lines of the *Wanderer* quoted above describe, not merely a gesture of affection and loyalty, but an action which, if not so formal as the 'sword-oath' (cp. N. Kershaw, *Anglo-Saxon and Norse Poems*, 1922, p. 163), is at least symbolic of a state of complete submission.

MARGARET ASHDOWN.

LONDON.

THE PLAY OF 'MARCUS GEMINUS' AND ITS SOURCE.

On the occasion of Queen Elizabeth's famous visit to Oxford in 1566 the first play to be produced was a Latin drama on the story of one Marcus Geminus. Robinson's account tells us it was dramatized by certain students of Christ Church, with the assistance of Richard Edwards, then Master of the Children of the Chapel Royal, and was written in prose¹. Dr Boas remarks that 'its source appears not to have

¹ C. Plummer, *Elizabethan Oxford*, pp. 178-9.

been traced¹. He gives, however, the following summary of the action, taken from Bereblock's account of the royal visit:

licuit statim in scena Geminum Campanum inspicere, a Duillio et Cotta apud Alexandrum Severum invidia ac aemulatione falso accusatum, servos, agricolas et rusticos, corruptelarum illecebris irretitos testes introductos; nihilque tum magis ridiculum, quam istos contemplari, tanquam in certa victoria sordide triumphantes, de Gemini supplicio decernentes, de facultatibus dividendis rixantes, adeoque inter se pugnantes, deinde suum infortunium lamentis muliebriter lachrimisque deplorantes. Ubi satis ita lusum est, libertini postea honestiores introducuntur, quos nec poena nec premium ad iniuriosam accusationem potuit deducere. Istorum ergo chirographa, testificationes, indicia, quaestiones rem manifestam fecere. Servi igitur tum accusatores, imperatoris mandato, cruci affiguntur, Duillius et Cotta debite plectuntur, libertini remunerantur, Geminus absolvitur.

It is curious that the mention of Alexander Severus has not led scholars of the English renaissance to trace this story to its appearance in Sir Thomas Elyot's *Image of Governauce*, one of the popular books of the age, where it is related at great length in chapters 38 and 39. As told by Elyot, the Emperor is met on his way to the senate by certain freedmen from Campania who accuse Marcus Geminus of conspiracy, with one Oninius, against the State. Alexander promises justice, and the accusers revel in the taverns in expectation of their victory. A secret investigation is then made as to the reputation of Marcus Geminus, both in Campania and in Rome, and it is found that he is a just and upright man who is opposed by his tenants because he insisted on resuming certain lands wrongly taken by them from his father. Thereupon the Emperor, as a ruse, issues a report that Geminus will soon be condemned. The freedmen revel again. Duillius and Cotta, the movers of the accusation, come to Rome to be examined by the Emperor. They think him favourable, and go out and revel with their followers. The next day a great trial scene takes place. Lupus, counsel for the accusers, makes a speech, following which both sides are cross-examined at some length. Finally the Emperor exonerates Marcus Geminus and condemns the accusers to that punishment which they themselves had suggested for the defendant. The story ends with an account of the rejoicing of the populace and their shouts in praise of Alexander.

It will be seen that this play was eminently suited for performance at the visit of a sovereign. The praise of a just ruler was not only a favourite topic with the educated classes of the day, but it was an obvious compliment to Elizabeth herself. The shouts of acclamation at the conclusion of the play would be taken up by the audience and changed into a personal tribute to the Queen². Furthermore, it provided an excellent

¹ F. S. Boas, *University Drama in the Tudor Age*, p. 101.

² Unfortunately, the Queen was exhausted by the day's festivities and was not able to attend, as had been expected.

opportunity for costuming and stage effects. Bereblock tells us that magnificent palaces and buildings were constructed on the stage¹. Judging by what we learn from contemporary Revels accounts and from Serlio's treatise on scenography, the stage was probably set with a senate house and a tavern, with a background of buildings representing the city of Rome. This would allow for unity of place without much stretching of the imagination. As for unity of time, it seems likely, after comparing Elyot's story with Bereblock's summary, that several days were represented by the action. Messengers had to be sent to Campania and return, the freedmen must revel on one day and bewail their fate on the next, after the trial has taken place. It must be admitted, of course, that it would have been possible to compress this series of actions into one day, if the authors had so wished; and the phrase *ubi satis ita lusum est* is too vague to be of any use to us.

In connexion with this last point we must remember that the academic theory of the drama at that time was not as strictly neo-classic as has sometimes been supposed. Nicholas Grimald's tutor of some twenty years before, one Johannes Aerius, had approved of the former's use of an action covering several days, and had also approved of his use of a mixture of comedy and tragedy in the same play, a thing abhorred by the strict classicists². The tragi-comic plot of *Marcus Geminus*—for the enthusiastic mention of the revelling scenes by Bereblock leaves no doubt that the comic possibilities were fully developed—is evidence that these Christ Church students were continuing the free interpretation of the classical rules so successfully practised by Grimald, a member of their own college, a generation before and brought to the heights of success on the following night by Edwards, another Christ Church man, with his English tragi-comedy of *Palamon and Arcite*.

In the use of prose in a Latin play the authors were taking what must have seemed a very radical step. Not only were all the classical models in verse, but the subject-matter itself, being in large part of such a serious nature, would seem to demand the use of metrical setting. As for the comic scenes, the example of Plautus and Terence would have been enough to cause most sixteenth-century writers to stick to verse. Probably we have here an example of Italian, as opposed to classical, influence. Many prominent Italian dramatists had written vernacular comedies in prose in the early part of the century—one thinks im-

¹ F. S. Boas, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

² See Dedicatory Epistle to *Christus Redivivus* in L. R. Merrill, *Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald*, pp. 93-113.

mediately of Ariosto's *I Suppositi*—and only five years before had appeared Grazzini's *La Spiritata*¹. I know of no other influence that would have produced a drama in prose at this time. Finally, it is interesting to remember that in the very same year that radical ideas of literary form were thus invading the University, George Gascoigne was producing his own *Supposes*, a prose translation of Ariosto, at Gray's Inn.

LEICESTER BRADNER.

PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND, U.S.A.

MARSTON BORN IN OXFORDSHIRE.

It has been generally assumed that the dramatist John Marston was born at Coventry, and educated there in his boyhood, chiefly because the information about his father hitherto available describes the elder Marston as of Coventry. The will of this latter, made and proved in 1599, so describes him, but it has only been used in a very brief abstract. A perusal of the full copy at Somerset House suggests however that the elder Marston's property in and near Coventry was only recently acquired or leased, whereas property and interests of possibly much longer standing were held in Wardington and Cropredy, Oxfordshire.

The elder John Marston, in a grant to him of a crest on 29 November 1587, is described as 'late of the middle Temple Councillor at the Lawes now of the citie and countie of Coventrye².' He married, at a date which has only just been discovered, Mary the daughter of Andrew Guarsi. The name of his wife is known from the heraldic Visitation of Shropshire in 1623 and from Vincent's Collections at the College of Arms³. Grosart, using Hunter's *Chorus Vatum*, knew also of a mention of the widow of Andrew Guarsi marrying John Butler of Wardington, Oxfordshire⁴. Heraldic Visitations of Oxfordshire were printed by the Harleian Society in 1871, and from them it is found that Butler's marriage is noted in the Visitation begun by Harvey in 1566 and completed by Lee in 1574⁵. Now assuming, without discussion, that John Marston the dramatist was the John Marston of Brasenose College described in the matriculation register of the University of Oxford on 4 February

¹ The English translators of this play were more conservative, for *The Bugbears* is in verse instead of the prose of the original.

² *The Genealogist*, New Series, xxi, p. 205. *Publ. of the Harleian Society*, xxix (1889), Part II, pp. 349 *et seq.* (Visitation of Shropshire, 1623). *Publ. of the Harleian Society*, lxvi (1915). (Grantees of Arms, alphabetically arranged.) A true copy from drafts in the College of Arms, furnished by G. Ambrose Lee, Norroy, 11 June 1924, was printed in the *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, Fourth Series, ix, Pt II, pp. 194-5.

³ College of Arms MSS. Vincent, *Salop*, 134, 632.

⁴ *The Poems of John Marston*, ed. A. B. Grosart, 1879. Memorial Introduction. Hunter's *Chorus Vatum*, i, pp. 324, 325, and the inserted pedigrees (Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 24,487).

⁵ John Butler of Wardington is mentioned on p. 141.

1591/2 as sixteen years of age, and that, as other and later facts seem to prove, this Brasenose College Marston was the son of the John Marston who married Mary Guarsi, then this elder John Marston's marriage took place some time before 1575, possibly a year or two earlier, and Mary Guarsi was probably at Wardington and married from her step-father's home.

The registers of the church of St Mary Magdalene, Wardington, date from 1633, but an older register recently recovered is kept in the neighbouring parish of Cropredy¹. This old register, a thin paper one, now very fragile, with the leaves yellowed and browned and worn at the edges and with the ink of the entries faded, records (incompletely) christenings, marriages and burials between the two dates 1573 and 1602. Among the 'weddings' on leaf 19 verso is the following entry:

m^r John marston of London and mestris (interlined) marie Guersye of wardenton was married the XIXth day of sempteber².

The 'm^r' and 'mestris' were clearly afterthoughts; and the misspelling of the month may be noted. The entry follows immediately after one dated 23 January 1574, 17 Elizabeth, i.e. 23 January 1575 according to modern reckoning, and there are three more entries before one of 1575 is given. The last of the three following entries, however, is dated near the end of November, 18 Elizabeth, i.e. 1575. There can be little doubt that the Marston-Guarsi marriage took place on 19 September 1575.

And since John Marston the elder was married at Wardington while he was still keeping a chamber at the Middle Temple, and had property in Wardington, it is very probable that he made his home there for some years and lived there out of term time.

On leaf 3 recto of the same register, among the christenings, is the following entry:

John Marson the sonne of maister John marsone was Baptised the vijth daie of October in the xvijth yeare of our soueraigne Ladie quene (interlined) elizabethe et an—('ano Domini 1576'—deleted).

The final e's of 'marsone' and 'elizabethe' are doubtful, since they come at the worn edge of the paper. The entry has every appearance of a special one, and although it follows after some in 1577 and comes immediately before one in 1578—according to year dates given in a different and apparently slightly later handwriting—is nevertheless dated precisely enough in itself. I think there is little doubt that the 'maister John marsone' of this entry is the same as the 'm^r John marston of London' of the marriage entry, and that 'John Marson the sonne' was

¹ I am indebted to the Rev. G. Barr, vicar of Cropredy, for permission to inspect the register.

² Italicised letters indicate expansions of handwriting abbreviations.

the dramatist-to-be who was thus christened on 7 October 1576 and born probably a few weeks earlier. This John Marson (or Marston) would be in his sixteenth year on 4 February 1591/2.

Conjectures as to the length of time of the elder Marston's stay in Wardington and the date of his migration to Coventry are of small moment here.

It is probable that when the elder Marston was thinking of a college for his son his thoughts were turned towards Brasenose by the fact that that college was, and is still, the principal landowner in Cropredy and district. And it is interesting to note that the dramatist Marston, on the death of his father in 1599, came by will to enjoy the lease of two houses, with gardens, orchards, 'cloases,' and 'four yeardes of lande' in Wardington, the lease of 'those meadowes and groundes' called the Overeys, and, after the death of his father's father-in-law Butler, the interest in 'the Farm of Wardington and Nyne yardes of lande' after certain conditions had been fulfilled; and he also had a half-interest with his mother in 'all those meadowes called the Hamme in the parishe of Cropredie,' with the tithe hay thereof, after the death of John Butler.

R. E. BRETTELE.

OXFORD.

ELYOT'S 'GOVERNOUR' AND PEACHAM'S 'COMPLEAT GENTLEMAN.'

In the address to the reader at the beginning of *The Compleat Gentleman*¹ (1622), Sir Thomas Elyot is mentioned as one of the writers² who had dealt with the subject which Peacham is about to treat. Although he does not acknowledge specific indebtedness to Elyot, an analysis of *The Compleat Gentleman* shows that in several chapters the author was drawing directly from Elyot's *The Governour*³.

In the first three chapters of Peacham's book—'Of Nobility in General,' 'Of the dignitie and necessitie of Learning in Princes and Nobilitie,' 'Of the time of Learning, Duty of Masters, etc.'—the debt to Elyot is not at once susceptible of proof, even though the similarity of thought in general is sufficiently obvious. Especially noteworthy is Peacham's discussion of degree and order (ch. 1) which may be compared to a similar exposition in *The Governour*⁴. It is, however, in retrospect that

¹ All references in this paper are to the reprint of the 1634 edition of *The Compleat Gentleman*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1906.

² For Peacham's indebtedness to Scaliger and Puttenham, see Spingarn, *Seventeenth Century Critical Essays*, I, p. 241 n.

³ References to *The Governour* are to the edition by H. H. S. Croft, 2 vols., 1880.

⁴ Cp. *The Governour*, I, pp. 4, 11-12 and *The Compleat Gentleman*, p. 1; *The Governour*, I, p. 5 and *The Compleat Gentleman*, p. 2; *The Governour*, II, pp. 27-32 and *The Compleat Gentleman*, pp. 2-3, 5 ff.

the agreement in thought of the earlier chapters of Peacham's treatise with certain passages in Elyot's most famous book becomes significant. Correspondences between the sixth, seventh, and sixteenth chapters of *The Compleat Gentleman* and certain parts of *The Governour* are of a quite demonstrable character, and serve to give importance to all other similarities between the two works, though the latter may not be convincing as evidence when presented alone.

The sixth chapter, 'Of stile in speaking, writing, and reading History,' follows Elyot fairly closely, prescribing the same authors for the same reasons as *The Governour* had done, and often in similar phrasing and order. Elyot in his 'What order shulde be in learninge, etc.' (Bk 1, ch. x), and in 'The mooste necessarie studies, etc.' (Bk 1, ch. xi), is concerned primarily with subject-matter, incidentally with style; whereas Peacham is concerned primarily with style, incidentally with subject-matter. Even so, correspondences are striking. Compare the following:

The Governour.

In so moche as Cornelius Tacitus, an excellent oratour, historien and lawiar, saithe, Surely in the bokes of Tulli, men may deprehende that in him lacked nat the knowlege of geometrye, ne musike, ne grammer, finally of no maner of art that was honest: he of logike perceived the subtiltie, of that parte that was morall all the commoditie. . . there failed nat in him substanciall lernyng in the lawes Civile, as it may appiere as wel in the bokes which he him selfe made of lawes, as also and most specially in many of his most eloquent orations: whiche if one well lerned in the lawes of this realme dyd rede and wel understande, he shulde finde specially in his orations called Actiones agayne Verres, many places where he shuld espie, by likelihode the fountaynes from whense proceded divers groundes of our commune lawes.

(1, pp. 157 ff.)

The Governour.

. . . And than, accordynge to the counsaile of Quintilian, it is best that he begynne with Titus Livius, nat onely for his elegancie of writinge, whiche floweth in him like a fountaine of swete milke: but also for as moche as by redynge that autor he maye knowe howe the mooste noble citie of Rome, of a small and poure begynnyng, by prowes and vertue, litell and litell came to the empire and dominion of all the worlde. (1, pp. 82-3.)

The Compleat Gentleman.

There wanted not in him (saith Tacitus) knowlege of Geometry, of Musicke, of no manner of Art that was commendable and honest: he knew the Subtilty of Logike, each part of Morall Philosophy, and so forth. How well he was seene in the Civill Lawes his Bookes De legibus and the Actions in Verrem will shew you: which are the rather worthy your reading, because you shall there see the grounds of many of our Lawes heere in England. . . (p. 45.)

The Compleat Gentleman.

. . . The next Titus Livius, whom like a milky Fountaine, you shall every where finde flowing, with such an elegant sweetness, such banquet-like varietie, that you would imagine other Authors did but bring your mouth out of taste. In his first Decade, you have the comming of Aeneas into Italy, etc., etc.

[Peacham then shows how Livy traces the rise and growth of the Roman Empire. He expands the original.] (pp. 47-8.)

The Governour.

With hym (Zenophon) maye be ioyned Quintus Curtius who writeth the life of kyng Alexander elegantly and swetely. In whom may be founden the figure of an excellent prince, as he that incomparably excelled al other kinges and emperours in wysedome, hardynes, strength, policie, agilite, valiaunt courage, nobilitie, liberalitie and curtaisie: where in he was a spectakle or marke for all princes to loke on. (1, pp. 84-5.)

The Compleat Gentleman.

... Bee then acquainted with Quintus Curtius who passing eloquently with a faithful penne and sound judgement, writeth the Life and Acts of Alexander; in whom you shall see the patterne of a brave Prince, for Wisedome, Courage, Magnanimity, Bounty, Courtesie, Agility of body, and whatsoever else were to be wished in Maiesty.... (p. 48.)

There are additional examples of Peacham's indebtedness to *The Governour*¹, in the sixth chapter of his book, but it seems unnecessary to give further quotations from this chapter. It should be noted, however, that Peacham expands his chapter by dividing history into four branches—Geography, Chronology, Genealogy and History—and by suggesting reading in the history of one's own country, etc. He then devotes a separate chapter to a discussion of cosmography—a topic which Elyot had discussed in the section of *The Governour* from which Peacham took his matter on style and history.

The first three pages of the seventh chapter, on cosmography, follow Elyot closely. The necessity of this study to the understanding of history, the pleasure derived from the survey of the world, as it were, in a nutshell, the disasters of Cyrus and of Crassus, respectively, because of their ignorance of the lie of the land, are common elements in the two books; as is also the reference to Alexander. Compare:

The Governour.

For he [Alexander] caused the count-
rayes wherunto he purposed any enter-
prise, diligently and cunningly to be
discribed and paynted, that, beholdynge
the picture, he mought perceyve whiche
places were most daungerous: and where
he and his host mought have most easy
and covenable passage.... (1, p. 78.)

The Compleat Gentleman.

... Alexander, therefore, taking any
enterprise in hand, would first cause an
exact mappe of the country to be drawne
in collours, to consider where were the
safest entrance, where he might passe
this River, how to avoyde that Rock, and
in what place most commodiously to give
his enemy battaile. (p. 57.)

The sixteenth chapter 'Of Exercise of the Body' owes much to *The Governour*. The debt is discernible in the order of the topics, the thought, the phrasing, the purpose of exercise. The purpose indeed is to preserve the health, to refresh and invigorate the mind in time of peace, and to keep the body prepared for war. Peacham prescribes exercises in the following order: riding, tilting at tournaments, throwing, leaping, wrestling, running, swimming, shooting, hunting and hawking. Compare the order of these subjects as treated by Elyot: wrastlynge, rennynge,

¹ Cp. *The Governour* (Croft), 1, pp. 85, 84, and *The Compleat Gentleman*, pp. 46, 49-50, for similar passages on Cæsar and Xenophon respectively.

swymmyng, rydyng, huntyng, hawkyng, dancyng, shooting—only a slight variation from the order in Peacham¹.

Common arguments for these pastimes, similar illustrations and phrasal likenesses show that Peacham was writing with his eye on *The Governour*. Compare the following passages:

The Governour.

Also rennyng is bothe a good exercise and a laudable solace. It is written of Epaminondas the valiant capitayne of Thebanes who as well in vertue and prowesse as in Lerninge surmounted all noble men of his tyme that daily he exercised him selfe...with rennyng, etc....

Semblably before him dyd the worthy Achilles, for whiles his shippes laye at rode, he...daily exercised (his people) and himselfe in rennyng, wherin he was most excellent and passed all other, and therfore Homere, throughout all his warke calleth hym swifte foote Achilles....

The great Alexander beyng a childe, excelled all his companions in rennyng.... (I, pp. 174-5.)

The Governour.

There is an exercise whiche is right profitable in exstreme daunger of warres...I meane swymmyng.... (I, p. 176.)

The Governour.

What benefite received the hole cite of Rome by the swymmyng of Oratius Cocles, which is a noble historie and worthy to be remembred.... [Here Elyot relates this incident in detail.] (I, p. 178.)

[Elyot tells here of a place in the Tiber adjoining the Campus Martius in which the Romans practised swimming.]

For other examples of similarities, see the passages on shooting and hunting².

AUSTIN, TEXAS, U.S.A.

The Compleat Gentleman.

Running and Agility of Body have beene esteemed most commendable in the greatest Princes and Commanders that ever lived; and the old Romanes...chose their souldiers by running.

...Homer gave Achilles...the epithite of ἀκὺριος or swift-footed. And Alexander we reade excelled all his Court in running. (pp. 215-6.)

The Compleat Gentleman.

The skill and art of swimming is also very requisite in every Noble and Gentleman, especially if he looketh for employment in the warres....

The Compleat Gentleman.

Horatius Cocles onely by the benefit of swimming saved his cuntry.... [Here Peacham tells the incident at length.]

[Peacham tells also of the swimming-hole for the Romans.] (pp. 216-7.)

D. T. STARNES.

GRENOBLE MS. 866.

Below will be found the text of the Grenoble MS. 866, kindly copied by Mr R. T. Butlin and referred to on p. 232 of the April number of the *Review*. The entry in the catalogue of the Grenoble Library is as follows:

MS. 4148. 866. Un feuillet d'un roman en prose. 'En ceste dolor et en ceste angoisse que il sostenoit, einsinc comme | il pansoit en ceste maniere et ploroit, si emtroi (sic)

¹ *Governour*, I, pp. 169-269; *Compleat Gentleman*, pp. 213 ff.

² *Governour*, I, pp. 286 ff., 186-196; *Compleat Gentleman*, pp. 217, 218.

les ondes de la | mer soner; et il lieve la teste, si regarde devant lui et voit une nef | venir qui uns honz amenoit....'

XIV^e siècle. Parchemin. 1 feuillet à 2 col. 271 sur 191 millim. (Don de M. E. Chapter.)

From an indication on the MS. itself, it appears that it was acquired in 1886. The conservateur, M. Royer, to whose courtesy I owe the information now supplied, supposes that it was found inside the cover of some register. It will be recalled that the MS. is mentioned as a prose *Tristan* in the *Catalogue Général des MSS. des Bibliothèques publiques de France*, VII, p. 260, and that it is included, though with a query, by M. Vinaver in the list which he gives of the prose *Tristan* MSS. in his *Études sur le Tristan en Prose*. Löseth, in his *Roman en prose de Tristan*, admits that he has not found the incident of the arrival of the mystic boat with the great red cross, contained in the Grenoble fragment, in any of the Paris MSS., though he sees a parallel to the story of the arrival of the boat in the description given in Bibl. Nat. Fr. 24400 of the fisher arriving in King Marc's island.

It seems probable that the fragment has been supposed to be a prose *Tristan* on account of the allusion to the 'voille autresinc blanche come nois negee.' There is perhaps a certain similarity here with the episode of the white sail, which was to indicate the arrival of Iseut la Blonde in Brittany, when summoned by Tristan in his last extremity. But the general tone of the fragment seems to be far more in accordance with the Arthurian legend proper than with the *Tristan* story. It may be added that the scribe appears to have been careful and accurate, and that some of the dialectal traits are those found in Picard.

(Column a)...et obscur et il ala entor lo siege de la roiche tant com il pot trover voie, et tant qu'il entra ou santier copé qui menoit a la cave. Et quant il vint a l'antree si la trova si laide et si noire que il n'entrait dedanz por nulle poine. Et quant il vit que il n'i troveroit nul confort si s'assist et comença mout durement a sospirer dou cuer et a plorer des iaux. Et pansa en son cuer que or avoit tot perdu si nostres sires l'avoit mis en obliance et en non chaloir.

En ceste dolor et en ceste angousse que il sostenoit einsinc com il pansoit en ceste maniere et ploroit, si emtroi (*sic*) les ondes de la mer soner. Et il lieve la teste si regarde devant lui. Et voit une nef venir que uns honz amenoit que mout estoit de grant biauté. En ceste nef estoit li biaux honz toz seux. Et si seoit ou chief devant, lo viaire totes voies torné de vers la roiche. Celle nef estoit mout petite, tote d'argent. Et si estoit li maz d'or, et la voille estoit autresinc blanche come nois negee. Et si avoit ou mi leu une grantz crois tote vermoille. Et quant elle fu arivee a la roiche, si fu avis au roi que totes les bones odours que l'en porroit deviser ne savoir n'en herbes ne en arbres fussient en la nef amassees. Quant il vit en la voille lo signe de la sainte crois si fu auques aseurez, quar il pensoit bien dedanz son cuer que a paignie de crois ne pooit avoir chose don mauz li venut.

Lors issi li biaux hons hors de la nef. Et li rois quant il lo vit hors venu, si se dreça en contre lui, et li dist que bien fut il venuz, si li anelina et li biaux hons li comença a demander qui il estoit, et il li respondit qu'il estoit crestiens. Et oïl li comença a enquerre coment il estoit (*col. b*) iqui venuz. Et il li dit por voir que il ne

savoit comant, ne mais que en tel maniere si estoit trovez. Lors li demanda li rois qui il estoit et que si lui plaisoit si en deist verité. Et li biaux honz li dist que il estoit menestrierz de tel mestier que il ne fu onques mais antex oiz. Et si ne pooit nuls honz rien savoir ne ovrer si par lui non. Lors li demanda li quex mestier ce estoit. Et il li dist qu'il savoit un let home ou une laide feme changer en biauté quant lui plaisoit. Et si savoit autresinc bien de fol faire sage et de povre riche, et de bas haut quant il li venoit a volenté. 'Certes, Sire,' dist li rois, 'ciz mestiers a toz passez ceux que nuls honz mortex porroit savoir por soi. Et si vos plait or me dites coment vos estes apelez.' Et il li dist que il avoit non tot en tot. Et li rois li dit que mout avoit haut non et haut mestier. Et si li dist: 'Sire, il m'est avis a cel signe de la crois que vos avés en vostre compaignie que vos estes de la creance Jhesu Crist.' Et cil li dit maintenant: 'Di va, por ce por je cest signe avoec moi que sanz lui ne puet on parfaitemant nulle bone ovre. Et tant com tu avras ce signe en ta compaignie tant porrés tu estre seurs et certains que nulle riens ne te sera nuissanz por quoi tu i aies parforte creance. Ne ja a cel home que cest signe ne port garde que tu n'i tignes compaignie. Quar cil n'est mie de part Deu qui avoques lui ne lo porte.'

Mout parla li honz au roi longuemant et tant li dist parolles de solaz et de confort que il li fit totes ses dolors (*col. c*) oblier, ne de nulle terriane viande ne li prenoit fans. Et li rois li demanda consoil coment il lo feroit, s'il demoroit encor illuec ou se il li looit que il s'en alast. 'Coment,' dist li honz de la nef, 'don ne dis tu que tu as tote ta creance en Jhesu Crist?' Et li rois respondit que voirement croit il de tot en tot en Jhesu Crist. Et li honz de la nef li dist, 'Or saches donques de voir que il ne t'a mie mis en obli.' Quar il n'oblira ja nelui qui a lui s'atande, ne qui l'ait en remembrance totes voies. Et la ou li honz s'esmaie de nulle chose qui li convingne, la te di je de verité que il est hors de creance. Quar, puis que il a mis et lo cuer et lo cors en la creance Damideu, don est bien droiz que il s'atande a lui de totes les choses don il est besoigneux. Quar tex est la costume de Deu que il aime plus hom et en graignour cherté lo tient que ne fait li honz meimes. Dont est il bien droiz et reisons que li honz ne pragne soi nulle cure de ce qui li coviendra, mais a celui en lait covenir qui plus l'aime que il meismes ne s'aime. Et la ou li honz s'entremet sor Deu de lui ne de sa besoigne, la chiet il en desesperance tot autresinc com se il disoit a celui qui l'en blasmeroit: 'Biaux Sire, volez que je m'atande a Deu de totes les besoignes qui me coviendroient? Cuidez vos qu'il a tote sa pansee a moi? Il a assez a panser allours,' illuec chiet il en desesperance ou il dit et panse ceste desloiauté. Quar il tient la deité per mortel la ou il dit, 'Il a assez a panser.' Et ce vaut atretant come se il disoit 'Si Deus voloit panser a moi et a totes les autres (*col. d*) gens, et il voloit de tot ce venir a chief, il coviendrait que toz ses panser venit a noiant, quar il ne porroit mie venir de totes choses a chief.' Et por ce poeiz vos vooir et conoistre qui ciz qui est en cest panser, n'a de creance ne tant ne quant, aincois est pires que nuls publicans. Mais savours (*sic*) cest Salomonz qui ot de sapience outre ce que nature ne puet doner a nul home mortel, cil en dit a son fil la ou il l'entreduissoit, 'Biaux fiz, si tu viaux consoil profitable, je le te donrai, et tu ne le giter mie puers, aincois lo tien totes hores enclos et saelé dedanz ton cuer. Garde que tu laisses Damideu toz jors covenir de toi, ne ja autremant ne t'en entremet.'

Entrementiers que li honz de la nef disoit cestes parolles, si furent au roi si tres durement plaisanz que il s'entroblija en l'escouter, ne il ne pansoit ne tant ne quant a fam, ne de nulle riens ne li sovenoit fors de ce que il ooit. Et tant li plot ce que il escoutoit que il fu une grant piece autresinc come cil qui une avision aparvint de nuiz, qui ne set certainement se il l'a veüe en dormant ou en voillant, et si cuide a la foie[e] que il dorme, et a la foiee cuide que il voille. Tot en ceste maniere estoit li rois que il ne savoit nulle certaineté de lui, ne il ne savoit se il estoit ou se il n'estoit mie. Et quant il eschapa de cel panser et il fu revenuz a son memoire, si comença a regarder environ lui, ne il ne vit onques ne la nef ne celui qui dedanz estoit venus. Et il se dreça en son estant si regarda de totes parz en la mer. Et quant il vit que il ne lo porroit en nul sen chosir si se rassit.

Lors comença mout durement a panser de rechef, et mout se....

REVIEWS

Beowulf. Translated into Modern English Rhyming Verse, with Introduction and Notes. By ARCHIBALD STRONG. With a Foreword on 'Beowulf and the Heroic Age' by R. W. CHAMBERS. London: Constable. 1925. lii + 100 pp. 12s.

Beowulf. Translated into English Verse with an Introduction, Notes and Appendices. By D. H. CRAWFORD. London: Chatto and Windus. 1926. xxi + 160 pp. 5s.

The addition of two new translations of *Beowulf* within less than a year to the comparatively large number which have been published not only in England and America but also on the Continent is welcome evidence of the publishers' faith in the vitality of the interest in Old English Literature. Old English scholars may well be grateful to the translators for what they are doing to popularise a knowledge of the literature, history and institutions of Anglo-Saxon England, and to explode the myth that there is little or nothing of value in English literature before Chaucer. An age which produced the greatest extant example of the Teutonic epic, which beheld the Christianisation and civilisation of Teutonic heathendom, which produced the greatest historian of the fresh advance of Christianity, with his genius for story-telling not unworthy of Herodotus, which gave to England the noblest of her kings, and afforded classical and ecclesiastical learning an asylum and a home when it was either dead or dying in the rest of Western Europe is surely an age worthy of the careful study of everyone who claims to speak with authority on the history of English Language or Literature. Professor Chambers tells us in his 'Foreword' to Professor Strong's translation that 'It is a period which it is vital for us to try and understand, if we are to follow either our national history or that of Western Europe.'

The two translations under review are both alike in this, that they have been produced in a most attractive form and are excellent examples of book-making, particularly Professor Strong's, which, however, is more than double the price of Mr Crawford's and calculated (apart from Professor Chambers' 'Foreword') to appeal, perhaps, more to the lover of *belles-lettres* than to the scholar. At the same time, both books maintain a high level of accuracy in the translation and are based on the results of most recent scholarship, though there is a radical difference of style and method between them.

There will probably never be complete agreement regarding the best metre for translating *Beowulf*, any more than for translating Homer. We are by no means convinced that those ignorant of Greek will not

get a better notion of the *Odyssey* from Butcher and Lang's prose translation than from even the best metrical version, or that Dr Clark Hall's prose translation of *Beowulf* does not, on the whole, reproduce the atmosphere of the original more accurately than Professor Strong's or Mr Crawford's. They are both 'pretty poems,' especially Professor Strong's, 'but we must not call them *Beowulf*.'

But waiving this point, there would appear to be two main schools among the translators of Old English poetry: those who try to reproduce the original metre as closely as possible, and of these the most successful are Professor Leslie Hall and Professor Gummere; and those who, abandoning any attempt to reproduce the original metre, have recourse to blank verse or some other metre foreign to Old English poetry. Mr Crawford, with his four-stressed line, belongs more or less to the former school and Professor Strong to the latter.

The aim of both schools is to reproduce on the mind of the reader the same impression as that made by the original Anglo-Saxon. But it is exceedingly difficult to say what was the exact effect produced by *Beowulf* upon those who heard it recited in Anglo-Saxon England. All we can be certain about is how it affects us. To reproduce the matter of *Beowulf* is comparatively easy; to reproduce the manner is exceedingly difficult.

Beowulf, of course, is not Homer; but it shares with Homeric poetry several characteristics such as freshness, simplicity and a certain nobility of expression and ideas, which are associated with rudeness of form, and an art which is immature compared with that of Homer, but not rudimentary. To reproduce the freshness, simplicity and rugged nobility of the original without over-emphasising the rudeness of the form, or employing a vocabulary which is neither Anglo-Saxon, mediæval, nor modern English is the task of the translator. A word which suggests an utterly different *milieu* or order of society should not be used in a translation of *Beowulf*.

How far Messrs Strong and Crawford have succeeded may perhaps be gauged from the following short extracts:

For never the pride of Thryth
Knew that splendid queen of the people, nor the crime she wrought therewith,
In whose eyes no brave of that meiny so dear, save her master and mate,
Might gaze by the day-light, since alway for such had she bonds of hate,
Hand-written and deadly, for guerdon: and swiftly by stroke of the brand
Came quittance unto the captive when he passed 'neath the clutch of her hand,
For aye by the fair-chased falchion was his last account decreed,
The torment that ended his life-days. In sooth 'tis no royal rede
For any woman to follow, though in beauty she hath no peer,
That she who of peace hath the weaving should cut short a man so dear
Of his life, on pretence of an insult. Yet one garred her will to fail,
The kinsman of Hreming: for alway men told, as they birlled at the ale,
That less wrong she wrought to the people, less ravin and spite uncouth
At the tide when, with gold all glorious, she was given to the valiant youth
Offa, the well-loved athling, and sought at the hest of her sire
His homestead across the wan water, and had there her life's desire.

A. Strong, *Beowulf*, ll. 1934-49.

Brave queen of the folk,
 she displayed not the pride, the dread fury of Thryth,
 of whose dear courtiers, save her great lord,
 no bold one ventured, how daring soever,
 to gaze on her, face to face, with his eyes;
 else he might count on his doom by the hand-woven
 bonds of slaughter: thereupon instantly
 after his seizure the steel was his portion,
 so that the fair-patterned sword must decide it,
 proclaiming the murder. 'Tis no womanly habit
 for a lady to practise, though peerless she be,
 that a weaver of peace at a fancied insult
 should assail the life of a man beloved.
 But all this was ended by Hemming's kinsman.
 Men said, moreover, at the ale-drinking
 that she brought to pass less bale to her people
 and feuds of malice when once she was given
 to the youthful warrior, deckt with gold
 and dear for her lineage; when o'er the fallow flood
 voyaging, she sought, at her father's behest,
 Offa's hall; there in days to come
 on the royal throne, renowned for her goodness,
 she used, while she lived, her destiny well.

D. H. Crawford, *Beowulf*, ll. 1931-53.

It would be wrong to conclude this review without some reference to Professor Chambers' able 'Foreword' to Dr Strong's book. To praise Professor Chambers' work would be an impertinence; but it is impossible to withhold a tribute of admiration for the masterly fashion in which scholarship as exact as it is wide and humane, dialectical skill, and a keen sense of humour have been mustered in defence of the Saxons. Especially valuable to the young student, as well as to too many of his elders, is the parallel which Professor Chambers draws 'between the triumphs which form the subject of Bede's *History* and the losses which were taking place elsewhere' (pp. x, xi). The only point on which one, greatly daring, might venture to break a lance with Professor Chambers is his estimate of the amount of Greek known at the end of the seventh century in England. It is true that he can quote in support of his view the weighty authority of Bede, who, speaking of the school established at Canterbury by Hadrian and Theodore, says: 'Usque hodie supersunt de eorum discipulis qui Latinam Graecamque linguam aequè ut proprium in qua nati sunt norunt'; but apart from Bede himself, whose *Commentary on the Acts* shows an extensive knowledge of Greek, Alcuin, and perhaps Egbert, it seems doubtful whether the average Anglo-Saxon scholar generously credited by Bede with a fluent knowledge of Greek went beyond Aldhelm, who loves to besprinkle his pages with Greek words derived from glossaries, but never ventures upon a complete sentence in Greek.

S. J. CRAWFORD.

SOUTHAMPTON.

The Threshold of Anglo-Saxon. By A. J. WYATT. Cambridge: University Press. xiv + 126 pp. 5s.

Mr Wyatt is to be congratulated on having produced one of the best introductions to Anglo-Saxon that has yet appeared. The selections are admirable. Beginning with the stories of Moses and the Prodigal Son from the Bible, the beginner is introduced to the old romance of Apollonius of Tyre, which is followed by a conversation from Ælfric's *Colloquium*. Mr Wyatt has drawn largely from *The Chronicle*, but the extensive demands he has made upon this source are amply justified by the interest of the narrative, which includes passages, such as the story of 'Edward the Confessor and Godwin,' 'Hastings,' and 'Doomsday Book,' not usually selected for beginners. Room has also been found for extracts from the *Laws*, a Charter, Leechdoms, and a Charm. A specially noteworthy feature of the book is the synopsis of *Beowulf*. The whole story is given in carefully chosen extracts linked together by an interspersed summary. In addition we have selections from *The Gnostic Verses*, *The Seafarer*, *The Later Genesis*, and a Riddle. This reader is therefore not only an excellent introduction to the Anglo-Saxon language, but also to the literature. It is no exaggeration to say that there is not a dull page in the book; and we may say of it what another great scholar has said in a different connexion: 'Those who can read all this without wishing to read more may rest assured that there are other subjects to which they may more profitably devote their time than the study of Anglo-Saxon.'

Anglo-Saxon Grammar has been skilfully summarised in fourteen pages. The Notes are adequate, and as scholarly as one might expect from a teacher of Mr Wyatt's knowledge and experience. The Glossary is the work of Miss E. C. Latham. The book has been clearly and carefully printed.

The only points calling for comment which I have noted are: *forbigan*, 8, 50, is glossed 'bow down, depreciate, abase, humiliate.' In the context it should be 'pass by, avoid.'

scēatt, 'property, money,' does not appear in the Glossary, though Mr Wyatt translates *ne sceattes wiht* 'not a penny' in the Notes, 89, 812-13.

geong, 103. Is there such a form as *giengra*?

stȳric, 116. *stȳric* should be *stȳric*. **stȳor-ik(a)* - > *stȳerč* > *stȳerē* at an early date. Cf. *hēorcnian*: *hȳeran*.

S. J. CRAWFORD.

SOUTHAMPTON.

The Authorship of 'The Taming of the Shrew.' By ERNEST P. KUHLM. Reprinted from *The Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XL, No. 3, pp. 551-618. 1925.

'Few scholars,' says Swinburne in his *Study of Shakespeare*, 'would refuse to admit a doubt of the total authenticity or uniform workmanship of *The Taming of the Shrew*.' Mr Kuhl is one of those few, and in

a long article of 67 pages and 334 footnotes he endeavours to prove that Shakespeare wrote the whole play. One by one the points that have been urged against Shakespeare's sole authorship—(a) the alleged prevalence of once-used words, (b) the classical allusions, (c) the scraps of Latin and Italian, (d) slips in plot structure, (e) metrical peculiarities—are carefully tabulated and faithfully dealt with. As for (a), there are once-used words in suspected and unsuspected scenes alike, and therefore 'we cannot give the slightest weight to this argument'; as for (b), the classical allusions are such as one would expect in an early Shakespeare play, while with regard to (c), the foreign tags 'serve an artistic purpose' and should be regarded as 'the fruits of immaturity.' This leaves only (d) and (e)—'flaws in structure' and 'metrical peculiarities'—and these are easily dismissed. Flaws in structure are common throughout Shakespeare ('Quiller-Couch finds them in *Hamlet* and *As You Like It*') and the metrical peculiarities alleged by the critics lead to no definite conclusion. The rime-test is 'at best unsatisfactory,' and if the play contains doggerel, there is also doggerel in *The Comedy of Errors*. Besides, 'Shakespeare's metrical carelessness provoked the criticism of Jonson' and some modern critics have 'censured the jingling verse with which *The Tempest* concludes.' The latter part of the article is little but a running comment on the text of the play, the bearing of which on the question of authorship is not very obvious, especially as much of the comment is devoted to the Katharine and Petruchio scenes which have not been challenged. Generally, Mr Kuhl's observations are of a commonplace kind, though occasionally he shows some originality, as for instance in the discovery that Petruchio 'in his elemental energy, fearlessness and undaunted spirit' is 'slightly akin to Tamburlaine.' He also remarks on the 'striking fact' that the old play of *A Shrew* 'lacks humour.' This is certainly not a fact that has struck many of its critics; indeed, Swinburne considered the author of the comic scenes of this play the most powerful and original humorist of all the pre-Shakespearian dramatists. But there are passages in this article of Mr Kuhl's that suggest that his sense of humour is not very strong, e.g., his reference (p. 586) to the admirable conduct of Kate in the Shakespearian play in 'the scene at the country house when Petruchio is perverting the uses of food' and the solemn observation (p. 588) that 'it may be objected that the beating of a servant supplies no proof of single authorship, especially as *AS* [*The Taming of a Shrew*] also exhibits these acts of violence.'

The doubts of Shakespeare's sole authorship of *The Taming of the Shrew* are not of recent origin; they began to be heard as early as the middle of the eighteenth century, Warburton, in his edition of Shakespeare's plays of 1747, affirming that the most that could be said of it was that Shakespeare had 'here and there corrected the dialogue and now and then added a scene.' The view that the existing text contains work other than Shakespeare's has been held by a long succession of critics down to the present day—Farmer, Collier, Grant White, Swinburne, Fleay, Furnivall, Ellis, Dowden, Professor Herford, Dr Abbott, Sir Sidney Lee, Sir Israel Gollancz, Professor R. Warwick Bond,

Professors Schelling and Tolman and Mr J. M. Robertson among them. No doubt opinions of good scholars can be cited in favour of Shakespeare's sole responsibility for the play so far as it differs from the old *Taming of a Shrew*, but on the whole, as Mr Kuhl admits, modern Elizabethans favour Grant White's theory that to Shakespeare belongs only 'the recast Induction, and all the scenes in which Katharine and Petruchio are the prominent figures' with scattered lines, words and phrases throughout the rest of the play.

Any critic who, inspired with a praiseworthy desire to protect the canonical plays from the disturbing attacks of 'disintegrators,' feels it his duty to maintain the complete authenticity of *The Shrew* will perhaps derive some comfort from Mr Kuhl's pamphlet. At any rate, he will here find set down at great length almost everything that can be, as well as a good deal that should not be, said in favour of Shakespeare's authorship. Mr Kuhl's zeal in defence of the play is, in fact, greater than his knowledge of Shakespeare and the play-writers of his period, and it leads him to cite as evidence of the master's hand in *The Shrew* features which no one familiar with the Elizabethan drama at large would accept as distinctively Shakespearian, and to dismiss the arguments of all opponents, whether strong or weak, with equal confidence. Mr Kuhl has made no new contribution towards the solution of the admittedly difficult problem of the play's authorship. Having set himself the task of proving that the whole text is Shakespeare's he has endeavoured to perform it by systematically depreciating the force of all arguments to the contrary and magnifying every scrap of evidence and citing every authority that seems to support his view. Apparently he himself is unconscious of any difference whatever between one part of the play and another, finding a 'unity' that speaks of a single hand throughout and lavishing praise indiscriminately on suspected and unsuspected portions alike.

H. DUGDALE SYKES.

ENFIELD.

The Problems of the Shakespeare Sonnets. By J. M. ROBERTSON. London: George Routledge and Sons. 1926. xii + 291 pp. 15s.

Among the parlour games of the scholarly, one of the most favoured is that which goes by the name of The Shakespeare Sonnet Problem. The participators are confronted with four headless trunks, labelled respectively The Dark Lady, The Handsome Friend, The Rival Poet and Mr W. H. By the rules of the game it is the duty of the student to fit on to these trunks a series of detachable heads, but so far no one has been known to secure the maximum of marks. The Dark Lady's neck always oscillates uneasily on its base; the Handsome Friend's body, clad in aristocratic garments, sometimes bears a sea-cook's head; the Rival Poet always looks exceedingly uncomfortable; and Mr W. H. occasionally supports unwillingly the Droeshout portrait. The game is a very pleasant one, and is still going strong although it was born about 1820.

The latest contribution is that of Mr J. M. Robertson. In some respects, his book deserves to be put apart from many of its companions, for Mr Robertson has a mental acuteness which has been denied to many of those who have essayed the pastime; yet even here we seem to see the influence of a certain method which perhaps must always be associated with it. Mr Robertson's book is in two parts. The first presents an excellent summary of the sonnet literature, and here the author is in his element. With characteristic keenness he has been able to delineate the inner core of each theory, has been able to strip away the useless verbiage and the countless *obiter dicta*, revealing each separate explanation in its essential nudity. Characteristically, too, Mr Robertson has indicated poignantly the fundamental weaknesses of each new theory. Reading his book, we are sometimes tempted to believe that he is greatest as a destructive critic. He possesses an uncanny power of breaking down an opponent's guard, although his own science of fence has its particular weaknesses on the defensive side. The follies of the theorists are nowhere more ably revealed than in this first section of his study. It is in the second part that doubts begin to assail us, for Mr Robertson, not content with showing the insupportability of the ideas of others, has put forward his own explanation concerning the problem of the sonnets.

Naturally, no explanation of a question so complex as this can be summed up in a single phrase or so. The explanation is really a series of correlated explanations, the one dependent on the other. First, Mr Robertson—great disintegrator as he is—starts with a characteristic view of the Thorpe Collection. For him it is nothing but a miscellany, containing much work which is certainly not by Shakespeare. One's doubt here begins to assert itself. One notes that, unfortunately, Mr Robertson cannot agree with the other disintegrators. He condemns some sonnets which others would admit, admits some which are elsewhere rejected. The divergence of opinion is at least disturbing. When one passes further, the doubt grows deeper. What, it may be asked, are the grounds on which such decisions are based? Mr Robertson's answer is ready: 'Shakespeare, be it obstinately repeated, faults in his own way. From his outset he is in the front line; and his singular mastery of phrase and feeling, where he is really bent on using it, should bar the ascription to him of mere clumsiness of diction and fatuity of idea'—which simply means that, for the critic, Shakespeare can do no ill, that he must not be permitted to doze as Homer was known to do. Shakespeare is put apart from all the other poets, Milton, Wordsworth and their peers, and is allowed to have no 'prentice work. Herein lies the weakness of Mr Robertson's method. He will accept as Shakespeare's only what he wishes to accept; the rest he assumes must be the work of a lesser contemporary. Perhaps symbolical of his attitude is a remark that 'the Ely' portrait is the only one of Shakespeare 'that is at all satisfying.' The last word is the test by which Mr Robertson would judge the poems. Unfortunately, there are no other similar poems with which we may compare them, and we have to fall back upon the plays;

but the plays, says Mr Robertson, contain much that is not Shakespeare's. We are founding a supposition upon a supposition. When, therefore, Mr Robertson would reject the sonnet,

Not marble, nor the gilded monuments,

or the other,

The expense of spirit in a waste of shame,

or the other,

Those parts of thee that the world's eye doth view,

we cannot say him nay. We respect and consider his point of view, but we feel that, after all, this kind of criticism leads nowhere. The first of these three sonnets is universally accepted; Dr Mackail finds the second 'unmistakeably' Shakespearian. The fact remains that the Thorpe Collection professed to be Shakespeare's, and, although Mr Robertson has a theory regarding its possible suppression, there is at present no real justification for believing it unauthentic. It may have been; but may-be's, in literary criticism, are useless. One other thing must be noted. Mr Robertson, in dealing with Shakespeare's sonnets, habitually minimises the value of the contemporary sonneteers, whereas, to a reader of the Elizabethan cycles who is not dominated by Shakespeare's greatness, the one thing which seems most marvellous is the peculiar felicity which appears even in the most trivial collections.

In addition to the elaboration of this theory concerning the miscellaneous character of Thorpe's volumes, Mr Robertson has several intriguing suggestions regarding the origin of certain particular sonnets or series of sonnets. One of the most fruitful of these is the theory that some of the poems were written originally for inclusion in plays. It is obvious that several of the sonnets might have harmonised perfectly with the style of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* or even of *All's Well that Ends Well*, and Mr Robertson must be credited with having given what seems a very satisfactory solution concerning the inception of some of the more 'enigmatic' poems. Regarding 'Mr W. H.,' Mr Robertson inclines to the William Hervey theory, believing that most of the poems written in order to encourage a young man to marry were commissioned by him for the Countess of Southampton, whose husband he became later. Sometimes Mr Robertson's acuteness and subtlety take him too far, as when he finds that such lines in Sonnet 48 as

But thou to whom my jewels trifles are,

and

Within the gentle closure of my breast,

alike suggest a woman speaker. A man may surely refer thus to his own loving thoughts, and there are cases known of ladies who counted the jewels given to them by an admirer as mere trifles. The theory decidedly must not be pushed too far.

In general, Mr Robertson's book will do much to 'clear the air,' which, be it said, had lately become somewhat thick around the sonnet question. It is a sound and careful study of a complex problem, and, even if one

chooses because of the lack of positive fact to remain an agnostic, believing that not all that goes by Shakespeare's name is Shakespeare's, but that there is no positive justification for dogmatic assertion, one rejoices in Mr Robertson's eminently rational treatment. His style is downright and entertaining, enlivened by clever epigrams such as that in which he insists that 'Shakespeare is not a consummate *mot*-ing machine like Wilde.' It is really not with what Mr Robertson says that we quarrel; it is with what occasionally he does not take into account. To close with an example. It may be that Chapman is the rival poet, but to assume that he is simply because of Shakespeare's reference to an 'affable familiar ghost Which nightly gulls him with intelligence' is to lose sight of the facts (1) that we have practically no knowledge of Elizabethan poems in manuscript, and (2) that we can know nothing of Elizabethan conversation. One can easily imagine a meal at the Mermaid in which some poet speaks in his liquor of a familiar spirit who teaches him to write. Shakespeare has listened, but the speaker is dumb and anonymous to us. Such possibilities are always present because of our lack of positive facts. We can always indulge in theories, but the theories must ever be shadowy.

The difficulty in all this type of criticism is that the possibility of theorising is too vast.

ALLARDYCE NICOLL.

LONDON.

The Epigrams of Sir John Harington. Edited with Introduction and Notes. By NORMAN EGBERT McCLURE. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. 1926. 250 pp.

This edition of Sir John Harington's Epigrams is especially welcome, as the first that has appeared since 1633, and as containing 82 epigrams hitherto only preserved in manuscript. The Introduction is a pleasant piece of work in which right use is made of Raleigh's paper on Harington in *Some Authors*, and in which the errors of previous biographers due to confusion between different John Haringtons are carefully corrected. It is shown, for instance, that the epigrammatist was of King's College, not of Christ's, whereas even Dr Venn in his *Matriculations*, though not in his *Alumni*, identified the King's man with Harington's cousin, Lord Harington of Exton. There is a slip, however, when Dr McClure (p. 28) says that Dr John Still had been Harington's teacher at St John's. What Harington says of Still is: 'When my selfe came to him to sue for my grace as bachelor, [he] first examind me strictly and after answered me kyndly that the grace he graunted me was not of grace, but of merit; who was often content to grace my young exercises with his venerable presence; who from that time to this hath given me some helpes, more hopes, all encouragements in my best studies; to whom I never came, but I grew more religious; from whom I never went, but I parted better instructed.' So far as Harington's time at Cambridge goes, this seems merely to state that when he applied for his grace for the B.A., he was granted it by Dr Still, who in 1577/8 was already

Master of Trinity and, though not Vice-Chancellor, a member of the Caput: and that, on some occasions, Still was present when Harington was disputing in the schools, and continued to be his friend and adviser thereafter. It is again a slip (excusable in a writer who is not an Englishman) to speak of knights' widows as 'Lady Jane Rogers' (p. 14), 'Lady Mary Harington' (p. 32). I doubt if Harington meant that Audrey Malte, the natural daughter of Henry VIII, was named Esther (p. 7, n. 6) when he wrote that his father had the king's 'goodlie Esther' to wife. He may merely have been comparing the position of Audrey at court to that of the Biblical Esther. On p. 10, Dr McClure disputes the truth of Harington's statement that he remembered Lord Hastings of Loughborough dining with his parents at Stepney and walking out into the garden while prayers were saying. He does so on the ground that Lord Hastings died before Harington was born. This is an error. Lord Hastings, *teste* G. E. C.'s *Peerage*, died on 5 March 1571/2. He was a zealous Catholic which accounts for the conduct that offended Mrs Harington.

In his reprint of the Epigrams, Dr McClure follows the arrangement and, in the main, the text of the edition of 1618. He has collated this however with the text of other editions and with that given in two MS. collections, Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 12049, which was written, he says, about 1606 (though Ep. 21, l. 11, 'a Bible of the new translation,' suggests 1611 at earliest) and contains 414 epigrams, and C.U.L. Add. MS. 337, which was written in 1600 and contains 52 epigrams. The MS. readings adopted are generally a great improvement. To the Four Books of Epigrams of the printed editions, he has appended 82 epigrams which have only MS. authority. This again is a most important contribution.

The textual notes leave something to desire. They generally record readings of the 1618 and later editions which have been departed from in favour of a reading from one or other of the MSS. But they do not show from which MS. the reading adopted has been chosen. (No notice—probably with good reason—has been taken of versions of the Epigrams given in other MSS. than the two specified, though there are scores of the epigrams in commonplace-books.) The Latin mottoes given in ed. 1618 with Epigrams 143, 144, 145, the Latin glosses attached to Ep. 284 in ed. 1633, and the Latin Epigram and Addition appended to Ep. 294 (1618) are not given or mentioned. Some interesting variants of 1633 are ignored; thus, in Ep. 21, ll. 22–4, Ep. 152, l. 2, 'purer,' Ep. 166, l. 13, Ep. 181, l. 15, 'Sabine,' Ep. 231, l. 3, 'holy' for 'onely,' Ep. 305, l. 3, 'beare.' It is not noted that Ep. 346 does not appear in 1633. The printing has gone wrong in notes to Ep. 195, l. 16, 295, l. 2.

Misprints are far too common throughout the book. The most glaring case is on p. 88 where the three lines printed at the head of the page should be at the bottom. In Ep. 81, l. 4, 'knowledge' should be preceded by 'The.' In Ep. 205, l. 3 from end, 'to' should be omitted. In Ep. 223, l. 11, 'wise' should be 'wise man.' In Ep. 335, l. 3, 'in her' should be 'in his.' On p. 39 top, 'to the truth' should be 'to tell the truth.' On pp. 25, 38 the notes need re-numbering.

As for the notes on the subject-matter, for which these Epigrams were so rich a field, the editor was no doubt hampered by the need of compression. But the result is that while we have a great many notes which are properly textual, stating the place of an epigram in the MSS., we miss for the most part the notes we look for to explain allusions or plays on words, or rare expressions. No attempt is made to identify 'Sextus,' 'Lesbia,' 'Paulus,' etc., with historical characters, nor is the possibility of such identification considered. (See, however, his interesting letter in the *T.L.S.* 19 May 1927.) No comment is made on the light thrown by the Epigrams on Harington's character, opinions and friends, though one would think that his strong ecclesiastical interest and Catholic tendency might provoke surprise. Nor is it remarked that Epigram 302 (iv, 48) is the same as 81 (i, 80) and Ep. 329 (iv, 75) the same as 122 (ii, 26).

To go back to the text. Even where the best of the traditional readings have been selected, some emendation seems to be needed here and there. Thus in Ep. 16, l. 5, we have 'Her skin and teeth,' where *three* bright things are required. What should be substituted for 'and' is hard to say. In Ep. 35, l. 2, the metre seems to demand 'That *as* it seemes.' In Ep. 45, l. 4, the sense requires 'my Master *me* ordaines.' In Ep. 83, l. 7 from end, 'At least' should probably be 'At last.' In Ep. 160, l. 15, 'weary' should be 'do weary,' *metri gratia*. In Ep. 181, l. 16 from end, we need 'I count the tall.' In Ep. 186, l. 11, 'He home' should be 'He whom,' or a note should explain 'home' as = 'whom.' In Ep. 219, l. 7 from end, 'cleare' should probably be 'cleave.' In Ep. 223, l. 3 makes no sense. Does 'to some' stand for 'tis done'? In Ep. 236, l. 11, one is inclined to substitute 'pleas'd' for 'pleasant.' For the sense, though not for the rime, one would prefer 'gamesome' to 'gainesome' in Ep. 308, l. 6 from end. In Ep. 316, l. 3, 'take' should perhaps be 'make,' and in Ep. 321, l. 2, 'By Proces first' 'By Proces just.' In Ep. 330, l. 4, 'preaching' should probably be 'pearching.' In Ep. 336, l. 8, 'noblenesse' should probably be 'noblesse' (found in Ep. 398, l. 8). In Ep. 341, l. 8, 'the sterne' should clearly be 'the steere' (see *O.E.D.*). In Ep. 398, l. 13, 'Their' should probably be 'her.' (Who the 'Mary' was who 'translated' a college neither Dr McClure nor I know.)

Dr McClure deserves our thanks for putting us for the first time in possession of a collection of all Harington's Epigrams, and so facilitating researches of our own. If any fresh knowledge accrues from these researches, part of the credit of it must go to him. It would be unfair to demand that an edition of a difficult work made for the attainment of a Ph.D. should be an *édition définitive*. This certainly Dr McClure's work is not.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

The Monks and the Giants. By JOHN HOOKHAM FRERE. Edited by R. D. WALLER. Manchester: University Press. 1926. 139 pp. 7s. 6d.

Mr R. D. Waller deserves thanks for his excellent edition of Frere's burlesque poem. Suggested by Pulci and other Italian writers of jocose and plebeian verse in the octave stanza, it introduced something new into English literature, for, as Mr Waller shows, Frere began his work in 1813 and so anticipated W. S. Rose, whose *Court of Beasts*, based on Casti's *Animali Parlanti*, appeared in 1816, while the first Cantos of *The Monks and the Giants* did not appear till 1817. And, apart from priority of date, Frere's stanzas, put in the mouth of 'William and Robert Whistlecraft of Stow-market, in Suffolk, Harness and Collar-makers,' had an influence on later English literature much greater than those of Rose. Frere, the friend of Canning, was a brilliant classic and a consummate master of all the resources of the humorous verse-writer, and his merits were at once recognised by Byron. 'Mr Whistlecraft,' he said, 'has no greater admirer than myself. I have written a story in 89 stanzas in imitation of him.' That is the genesis of *Beppo* and after *Beppo*, of *Don Juan*. Unfortunately, Frere's mild candlelight was dimmed in the new blaze. *Don Juan*, too, had given a savour of immorality to Frere's form of verse, and after the appearance of his third and fourth Cantos in 1818, he published no continuation of his poem. But, even by the side of *Beppo* and *Don Juan*, *The Monks and the Giants* is most delightful reading.

Mr Waller's book is the first which has been assisted by the late Sir Adolphus Ward's bequest to the University of Manchester for the advancement of research in History and in English Literature. This perhaps accounts for the character of the Introduction of which Part I gives a critical history of Italian Serio-comic Romance, and Part II deals with Italian Romance in England. It is a careful and valuable account, which in Part I gives us perhaps rather more information than is needed for the enjoyment of Frere's poem. There are, besides, brief notes on allusions in the poem. I take the correctness of the text for granted, though in i, st. 27, l. 8, I feel a doubt if 'the' has not dropped out, and similarly in iv, st. 43, l. 5. Line 6 in ii, st. 60, should end with a comma, not a full stop. A note might perhaps have been given to 'goddesses of reason' (iii, st. 11), to 'Alarm'd at periwigs and human Tyes' (iii, st. 53), to 'as the man says in the play' (iii, st. 56), to the three styles, evidently a reminiscence of Cicero (iv, st. 12), to 'Cocles,' unless Macaulay has made him known to every schoolboy (iv, st. 14), and to the 'brief' granted for the relief of the monastery (iv, st. 127). One would have thought 'Arma virumque cano' a more apposite illustration of 'Arms and the Monks I sing' than the lines quoted from *Don Juan* and Barry Cornwall. It is a pity that the last lines of the clever Latin stanzas (iii, 24-26) are not printed as couplets, and the resemblance of structure between these Latin stanzas and the English stanzas made plainer. Is it worth suggesting that 'From Morgan's Chronicle' (i, st. 13) is Whistlecraft's perversion of 'From the Morning Chronicle'? The spellings 'Batrachomiamachia' (p. 1) and Citharon (p. 135) are hardly correct, and one is puzzled by 'it did still hang in

part to its origins' (p. 21) and 'no new stock is yet grafted on the English stem' (p. 28). But Mr Waller has reprinted a very delightful work and given us very great help towards understanding everything about it.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

English Prose and Poetry, selected and annotated. By JOHN MATTHEWS MANLY. Revised edition. London: Ginn and Co. 1926. xxviii + 882 pp. \$3.20.

English Verse and Prose: A new Anthology. Edited by ARCHIBALD T. STRONG and R. S. WALLACE. London: H. Milford. 1923. iv + 622 pp. 12s. 6d.

Each of these Anthologies—the one from America, the other from Australia—illustrates very fully the range and variety of our island literature and its diffusion over the English-speaking world. Professor Manly's, with its 752 pp. of extracts in double columns, preceded by 26 pages of translations from Anglo-Saxon, is an immense work, made portable by its use of very thin paper. It includes 116 pp. of useful notes on the extracts, a short and happy appreciation of the author being given in each case. Living authors are not excluded as they are by the Australian collectors. As might be expected, drama is only represented in either book by songs taken from the plays. Professor Manly's selections from FitzGerald's *Omar Khayyam* are, I am glad to say, from the last text of the poem and so have a great advantage over those in the 'additional poems' of the *Golden Treasury*, which go on accustoming boys and girls to readings which FitzGerald discarded and confusing them with two texts if they come later to know the poem in its most perfect form. The explanation (p. 211) of Milton's 'Atlantick and Utopian polities' as 'ideal commonwealths described by Plato and Sir Thomas More' seems to require the substitution of 'Bacon' for 'Plato.' Oscar Wilde's dialogue is crisp and sparkling, but why it should be described as 'crisped and sparkled' (p. 863) is not easy to say.

The Australian anthology was designed to accompany Professor Strong's *Short History of English Literature*, and so naturally does not include specimens of living authors, nor annotations and appreciations. It begins with 'Sumer is icumen in,' and illustrates a number of authors of established fame who are not found in Professor Manly's book. To take the first three letters of the alphabet, list (a) gives the authors included by Strong and Wallace but not by Manly, list (b) those included by Manly and not by Strong and Wallace: (a) Arbuthnot, Barnaby Barnes, William Barnes, R. Baxter, Berkeley, Lord Berners, the Bible, Bolingbroke, Borrow, Emily Brontë, Fulke Greville (Lord Brooke), T. E. Brown, R. Burton, Chesterfield, Clarendon, Cobbett, H. Coleridge, H. Constable, W. Cory, C. Cotton; (b) 'A. E.,' H. Belloc, Arnold Bennett, R. Blair, R. Bridges, Lord Buckhurst, Joseph Campbell, Edward Carpenter, G. K. Chesterton, A. H. Clough, Padraic Colum, J. Conrad.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

M. L. R. XXII

22

A Book for Bookmen, Being Edited Manuscripts and Marginalia, with Essays on Several Occasions. By JOHN DRINKWATER. London: Dulau and Co. 1926. x + 284 pp. 4s. 6d.

Mr Drinkwater's volume of essays and marginalia is fittingly dedicated to Mr T. J. Wise, for throughout it breathes the spirit of the treasured private library, the rarefied air of the eclectic and the unique. The most delicately written appreciation is that entitled *A Memory of George W. Smith*; two essays are devoted to the collections of Mr T. J. Wise and of Sir Edmund Gosse respectively; while scattered through the whole book are *obiter dicta* expressing finely the joy of the hunt and the joy of the possessing.

Mr Drinkwater, of course, is no miser. When he discovers, he wishes the world to know of his discovery, and he regards the finding of 'a new poet...a matter for just fervour.' He tells us, therefore, of his eager perusal of John Collop's neglected *Poesis Rediviva* or *Poesie Reviv'd* (1656), reprints Coleridge's MS. improvements in *Zapolya*, and provides extracts from Landor's letters which explain the gathering of verses for *Dry Sticks Fagoted*. None of the material is of really startling interest, but we are grateful to Mr Drinkwater for these things, for the charming records of the Arnold-Browning friendship and for the miscellaneous eighteenth and nineteenth-century letters presented in the final section of his book. Among the essays, special attention must be called to the sympathetic paper on the unfortunate Patrick Branwell Brontë, where that wastrel-genius is well set in his miserable surroundings, and to the equally sympathetic essay on William Cory, poet and failure.

Altogether, this is truly a 'book for bookmen,' fittingly to be read only in the shaded light of the study-lamp, quietly and reflectively. It strikes no passionate note, but in that is the truer to the subjects with which it deals.

ALLARDYCE NICOLL.

LONDON.

Authors Dead and Living. By F. L. LUCAS. London: Chatto and Windus. 1926. x + 297 pp. 7s. 6d.

To the literary historian of the future the present time will certainly commend itself as a period of conflict between classicism and neo-romanticism. That is to say, the rising generation feels itself possessed by all kinds of longings and subjected to all kinds of impressions which cannot be described in the old ways. Our ideas of what a human being can achieve, of what he can feel, of whence he came, of whither he goes, of his nature as an individual and as a species, of his duties on earth, and his chances in death—all have changed so completely that their expression must change also. So think the neo-romantics and they have experimented with a vengeance. But many of this generation as well as of the former feel that these transformations are superficial. Human nature remains at heart the same, and as literature does not, at its best, deal with the surface, literature must also remain the same. From time immemorial men have gone to poetry and fiction to learn how the

emotions respond to experience; how the ambitions, the passions, the moods of human beings are stirred by what happens to them. Such reactions will for ever go on in the old way, so the old prophets and bards are the best guides to their interpretation. Rising poets and prose writers cannot do better than draw their inspiration from these sources. Those who break away from the established traditional methods are breaking away from human nature.

It is from this point of view that Mr Lucas's essays are most worth reading. In one sense he is an uncompromising classicist. His appreciation is based on traditional criticism.

Till the next Columbus of poetry finds us a new world or a new egg, the poet of to-day had best own allegiance to the past, trusting to his own personality to keep him an individual, not a slave.

And again:

the tendency is not to live in a chaotic world, but in one reduced to such a devastating state of order that the thinking section of society has largely lost its scale of values and is thence in danger of ceasing to have any values at all. It has come to see through so many things.

He defines the note of greatness in poetry as being 'impressed with wonder, even awe—the sense that this is the doing of genius and it is marvellous in our eyes.' So most of the short essays reprinted from *The New Statesman* are, apparently, attempts to maintain this attitude. They lend themselves to such a purpose because they are short. Nowadays we are so accustomed, both in learned and in semi-popular periodicals, to snippets, essayettes, articles, that a writer has hardly enough space to seize upon the peculiar excellence of his author and so to indicate what his readers ought to enjoy and appreciate. As such, Mr Lucas (a sound classical scholar as well as an omnivorous reader in most modern languages) is admirable. At times he shows a wider sympathy and deeper insight, as when he dwells upon the modern melancholy which he discovers (and possibly himself feels) in *The Shropshire Lad* and the urge towards the unknown and mysterious which he appreciates so much in De la Mare. But assuredly he is most worth discussing when he passes judgment on present-day poetry.

His views will be found summarised in 'The Progress of Poetry,' and they are much the same as those held by Mr Harold Williams and Mr Alfred Noyes. Mr Lucas believes that at the present time we are suffering partly from 'that cancer of literature... the obsession with the need for novelty' but also from another and more complex disease. He is conscious of that vivid sense of other moods than the present, which seems to distract contemporary idealists, and may perhaps spring from the background of science on which all our minds are formed. 'More and more the past and the future force themselves before us, crushing the unhappy present like upper and nether millstones between them,' till the only two things which still inspire us are love and disillusionment. Can anyone wonder that a scholar who really believes all this of the present age should declare that what wakes 'the deepest and finest echoes in men's hearts are not the things that change; they are stronger

than custom and creed,' and should nourish his spiritual existence on the past or the ideas which arise out of the past?

Yet it is possible to hold another view. It seems to the present writer that Mr Lucas makes a mistake in believing that men now think more but act and feel less violently than they did. Most probably they act and feel with an equal or greater intensity, but in a different way. One of the most striking features of our own age is its multiplicity of pursuits and experiences, due partly to the many new forms of locomotion, partly to the new-found means of repairing, invigorating and prolonging life, partly to the wars, adventures and explorations in which an ever-growing number of people engage. These manifold experiences often take the place of literature. A schoolmaster once complained that boys used to study poetry but now they study Gamage's catalogues. If he had added that those commercialised broadsheets were sought so eagerly because they revealed the possibilities of a motor cycle we should not have agreed that there was no hope for the rising generation. It is not quite certain that a youth facing not only the hazards but the experiences of the open road, enjoying the varieties of rapid motion as well as its thrills, the sense of power and freedom, the privilege of changing neighbourhoods, as well as the horrors of the exhaust pipe—it is not quite certain that the life of such a youth is less expansive, or even perhaps less spiritual, than a life inspired by *Il Penseroso*, or *The Task*, or *Laus Veneris*. Possibly the anomalies of contemporary culture partly arise from the fact that people want to feel their emotions at first hand in their own actions. They prefer deeds to poetry, or they expect poetry to adjust itself to these more immediate experiences. They want their literature to express the spiritual possibilities which are opening out, thanks to these unspiritual means. Mr Lucas complains that poetry must always lag behind science and inventions. No doubt. But that is no reason why poetry should not use both inventions and science to see into a new world and rediscover human grandeur in new forms. No one will deny that the arts of language are not yet adapted to these unfamiliar functions; that new forms of expression must be invented and certain changes made in the technique of verse. No one will fail to note that the last generation of poets has not yet succeeded in effecting this transformation and that some of their efforts appear sufficiently grotesque to be taken for burlesques. But it is here submitted that the aim is not unworthy of attention and must be studied with action and personal experiences as a commentary.

But Mr Lucas is fully aware of these requirements? Yes. He feels the necessity for contact with the world in order that he may see it through the eyes of poetry. Has he not confessed that the vision of an artillery battle at night on the Somme meant more to him than to have read Dante? It is perhaps ungracious to fasten upon one illustration more than another, in order to disagree, but it seems that no such reminiscence would ever have been introduced if Mr Lucas really appreciated the modern poetry of personal experience. 'The horrible sublimity of that real Inferno stretched under the darkness of the

flame-shot sky.' There we have the picture, vivid, concentrated, romantic. But what does it really mean when interpreted as experience? Men and animals labouring through the long hours of the night in hauling ammunition; this monotonous toil continued indefinitely up to a certain day, to repair the waste of futile registering or the battery dumps blown up by enemy fire; lines of guns holding on to their half-concealed positions amid mud or flies; men, mules and horses killed quite ignobly, as part of the daily routine, by an enemy whom they could not see and who could not see them. And when the great day came for which these sacrifices were made, there is only a creeping barrage worked out on paper by the light of a gutted candle with calculations to allow for atmospheric pressure and the force of the wind, and fired off in monotonous rotation by gunners who probably never give a thought to their objective far away out of sight. But what about the enemy lines where these missiles fall? A sense of fear concealed by boredom, a continuous blend of shrieking, shuddering sounds in the night air sometimes followed by a harmless explosion in the vacant ground between trenches, and sometimes ending in a deafening crash over one's head and unforgettable reek of new earth, saltpetre and human blood. Does anyone really find such experiences to be more significant than Dante's vision which is not half so horrible or sordid or commonplace, and where the tortures symbolise the special nature of each crime—its peculiar vileness or evil influence—and its inevitable retribution here on earth? The point is that drum fire on the Somme is not in the least sublime or Dantesque unless viewed only from the distance as a picture, for artistic effect, while the new poetry requires that it should be lived through as it really happened. It is this attitude which the older school does not seem to find congenial. Obviously the older school is often justified in its aversion. Many things in this world are unsuited to poetical interpretation unless viewed from the distance, like artillery fire. But many other things about the twentieth century have a peculiar quality only to be extracted by a process involving realism and intimacy. They will then, and only then, be found full of significance, and will, perhaps, offer poetic inspiration worthy to be considered beside the traditional themes.

H. V. ROUTH.

LONDON.

Saint Joan of Orleans. Scenes from the Fifteenth-Century *Mystère du Siège d'Orléans*. Selected and translated by JOAN EVANS. The Text edited by PAUL STUDER. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1926. 7s. 6d.

The *Mystère d'Orléans* is a play that is of interest to the student of fifteenth-century French drama and language and history, for it preserves for us the estimation in which the town of Orleans held its deliverer and is the only mystery extant with a secular plot. Yet a play that contains 'two hundred and one scenes of varying length, demanding over twenty thousand lines for their expression' (Introd. p. xiii), is not exactly calculated to suit the taste of modern readers and

we may, therefore, be grateful to the Clarendon Press for producing a selection of the mystery in an attractive guise and still more to the editors for the care and skill with which they have carried out their rather thankless task. Nothing indeed lends itself more readily to facile criticism than the publication of a volume of selections.

In their choice of scenes the editors appear to have been guided in the main by the desire to set before us the scenes that, in their opinion, formed the older nucleus of the play. The *Mystère* is certainly composite in origin, as has been recognised by all who have made a study of it (cp. the edition of MM. F. Guessard et E. de Certain, Paris, 1862), and the present editors not only agree with their predecessors in considering the first 5330 lines to be an addition, 'written after 1439, possibly as late as 1470,' but have also made the further suggestion that the rest of the play is composite also and consists of an older part, based on scenes, performed in the triumphal procession, of which mention is made in the town accounts in 1435, and of later interpolations, e.g., the episode of Gasquet and Verdille and the battle of Rouvray (cp. *Introd.*, pp. xi-xii).

From the scenes selected, together with the detailed rubrics of those omitted, it is certainly possible to obtain a good idea of the sequence of events, but it is rather a matter of regret that space was not found to include also a few scenes from the first part of the play, e.g., the speech and petition of Charles d'Orléans and the more characteristic English scenes.

The translation is at times a little stiff and here and there the renderings are somewhat disputable (cp. ll. 68, 248, 508, 522, 679, 939, 1828); taken as a whole, however, it succeeds in giving a very fair and adequate representation of the language of the poem, and all those who have essayed the interpretation of the fifteenth-century texts will be well aware of the difficulties that beset the interpreter, for in no period of French is the linguistic usage more difficult to establish with precision, no period more lacking in exact studies of vocabulary.

The text is established with the meticulous care and precision to which all those who are acquainted with the late Professor Studer's work are accustomed. The collation of the text of the older editors Guessard and de Certain with the facsimile of the MS. has resulted in a number of emendations that are described too modestly on p. 187 as 'various small errors.' The few pages consecrated to the study of the language are a model of concision and clarity, but all philologists must regret that the editors were unable to allow themselves space for more detailed treatment of the linguistic usage, for this, by virtue of its colloquial and provincial character, is full of interest. In the marked effacement of the final consonants, the lowering of *i* to *ê*, the contraction of vowels in hiatus and in weakly stressed position, the pronunciation attested is in advance of that preconised by the grammarians of the following century; as we learn from the grammarians of the sixteenth century, its local traits infected often later on the speech of Paris (cp. the opening of *ê* < *a* tonic free to *ê*: 150 *mere*: *deputaire*, 432 *pere*: *faire*: *voire*; the lowering

of -yên to -yân: 420 *riens*: *argent*; the raising of *o* to *u*: 329 *propous*: *tous*; the lisping pronunciation of *r* as *z*: 799 *chaeze*: *plaise*, 311 *vois* (= *voir*): *congnois*).

The editor's suggestion that this last trait is of early appearance in the Orléanais (cp. p. 191) finds corroboration in the mention of this pronunciation in the fourteenth-century *Tractatus Orthographiae* of Coyfurelly, 'doctor in law of Orléans' (cp. *Zeitschr. f. neufranz. Spr. und Lit.*, I, pp. 16-22, and *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, v, pp. 185-7).

To Oxford readers this book is of a melancholy interest, for it is the last work to which Professor Studer was able to set his hand. Like all the others that we owe to him, it bears something of the impress of his personality in its quiet and sure scholarship, its careful concern for detail, its clarity and good judgment; what it naturally does not reveal, and what will remain as a permanent memory with his colleagues and friends, is the patience and the indomitable spirit of the man, to whose hard lot it fell to carry on his work for years, battling with health impaired and a constantly increasing physical lassitude.

M. K. POPE.

OXFORD.}]

Guy de Maupassant. Von HEINRICH GELZER. (*Sammlung Romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher*, II, iv.) Heidelberg: C. Winter. 1926. 208 pp. 10 M.

There is a good deal to be said for this little book; and there are one or two things to be said against it. The author is wise enough in the world's ways and sufficiently at home in his own mind to speak out. That is a great point with Maupassant and more than can be said of all his critics. And, unlike that brilliant and disquieting writer Léon Daudet (was ever man less like his father?), he is not astride any *dada*. Gelzer, in Jena, is 'au-dessus de la mêlée,' or outside it. He eschews polemics: and, for the moment, at any rate, that is a relief. But it is a great pity that he did not begin by making up his mind exactly how much ground one can cover in a couple of hundred smallish pages, and how to cover it. The writer of a small book must have a large waste-paper basket. He must not let his facts tyrannise over him. There is too much Maupassant here, strangely enough, and too little Gelzer. And it is a pity that the last chapter entitled 'Persönlichkeit' (which would have been the best but for an excess of 'Gründlichkeit') could not have replaced the Flaubert chapter at the beginning. It is not much to the point to compare Flaubert and Maupassant when the reader presumably knows neither. And moreover, unless we are mistaken, this particular job had been done already¹. We have not 'shadowed' the author: but on a first reading, it appears to us he has shown an originality and an independence not generally associated with 'Handbücher.' It was, however, a tactical mistake to sandwich criticism in between résumés of Maupassant's tales. Human nature will not stand that. For our own

¹ A. R. Riddell, *Flaubert and Maupassant*, Chicago, 1920.

part, too, we would willingly have sacrificed some of the numerous examples of 'Dreiklang' in Maupassant's style (we leave the reader to guess what that may be!) for the consideration of broader and blunter matters. Maupassant, like all born raconteurs, is merely a filter. Life passes through him: and he simply does not disturb it. But it is French life and he is a French filter. So that the German reader might well have been told what that means, with illustrations from the fabliaux and Rabelais and Scarron and Diderot and Voltaire and others to enlighten him. And, to enclose the whole matter within the walls of distinction, it might not have been amiss to have said a few well-weighed words about Pirandello and Conrad and Tchechov and Sherwood Anderson and the many masters of the short story in Germany since Konrad Ferdinand Meyer and Ludwig. Gelzer has not done this: and the omission is the more vexatious as he could have done it excellently.

D. G. LARG.

LONDON.

The Minor Poems of Dante. Translated into English Verse by LORNA DE' LUCCHI. London: H. Milford. 1926. ix + 172 pp. 7s. 6d.

A New Theory of Dante's Matelda. By RACHEL BLANCHE HARROWER. Cambridge: University Press. 1926. 64 pp. 2s. 6d.

The publication by Michele Barbi of the *testo critico* of the *Rime* of Dante for the first time made it possible for students to approach these lyrics with some confidence both as to the text and as to the discrimination between authentic, doubtful, and spurious pieces. Giuseppe Zonta's notable and original sixth-centenary study, in the 'Miscellanea Dantesca' of the *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*, was followed by his somewhat unsatisfactory popular edition and commentary. Since then Santangelo has raised a curious question as to the share to be assigned to the greater Dante in the sonnets interchanged with Dante da Maiano, and Barbi himself has investigated anew the matter of the *tenzone* with Forese Donati. But the whole field remains full of unsolved problems—more so, I think, than is the case with any other of Dante's minor works, except the *Convivio*.

Signora De' Lucchi has produced a complete translation, in the original measures, of the poems accepted as authentic by Barbi, following his text and adopting his order with the arrangement into seven books, but with the addition of brief introductions to each poem sometimes drawn from Zonta—though without references of any kind except to the *testo critico*. The attempt to combine her two sources where they disagree has proved confusing in the case of *Amor da che conven*, the 'montanina canzone,' which she follows Barbi in placing among the later poems written in exile, while accepting the view of Zonta that the letter to Moroello Malaspina should be associated with the 'rime per la donna pietra' (cp. pp. 132, 162). This is only one of various indications that Signora De' Lucchi has not quite realised the difficulty and complexity of her subject. Zonta is by no means an infallible guide, and

the translator seems to have been misled by him in several passages in the great canzone *Doglia mi reca*. But she has been singularly unfortunate with this poem. Her rendering of its opening lines ('Doglia mi reca ne lo core ardire/a voler ch' è di veritate amico') simply invites misunderstanding: 'Daring hath brought upon my heart great woe;/In that I fain would utter what is true.' Speaking of the power of love to unite *vertute* in man to *beltà* in woman, Dante bids ladies hide away their beauty, 'poi che non c' è virtù, ch' era suo segno.' Clearly the meaning is 'since there is no virtue, which was its mark'; not 'for its targe is not virtue verily.' Again, where virtue is represented as the handmaiden of the soul: 'Vertute, al suo fattor sempre sottana,/lui obedisce e lui acquista onore.' This surely does not mean: 'Virtue submission to her God doth show,/Acquires him honour and obeys his will.' The sense obviously is: 'Virtue, ever subject to her doer, obeys him and gains him honour'; for, as Dante himself says (*Conv.* iv, 17), the moral virtues 'da ogni canto sono in nostra podestade.' Signora De' Lucchi has been more successful with the earlier lyrics; some of the sonnets and ballate have been excellently rendered, as also the canzoni *Donna pietosa e di novella etate* and *Amor che movi tua virtù dal cielo*. But even better is her rendering of one of Dante's lyrical masterpieces, *Io son venuto al punto de la rota*, which strikes me as a really notable achievement in translation.

There has been so much throwing about of brains on the question of Dante's Matelda that we can only admire the courage of a writer who, apparently with a very limited knowledge of what has previously been published on the subject, claims to present 'a new theory.' But is Mrs Harrower's theory 'new'? It seems to me hardly more than a variant of the view, held by many scholars in one form or another, that Matelda represents the life of the Earthly Paradise. The Earthly Paradise figures 'blessedness of this life,' which is found in the exercise of the mind (*Mon.* iii, 16, *Con.* iv, 22), and Mrs Harrower would regard Matelda as 'the symbol of man's intellectual activity,' 'the symbol of this transformed faculty, at its highest degree of power and activity' (p. 35). This is a quite sound theory, whether new or not, but I would remark that it is not correct to say of the Earthly Paradise that 'the greatest problems are there as evident to it (the intellect) as the simplest rules of logic are on earth' (pp. 28, 29); the passages cited in support of this (*Par.* ii, 43, vi, 19) can only refer to the Beatific Vision. In her discussion of Beatrice's reproaches and Dante's public life, Mrs Harrower is evidently not acquainted with Parodi's interpretation of the difficult 'scuola' passage (*Purg.* xxxiii, 85-90) in his *Poesia e storia nella Divina Commedia*—a book which no student of Dante can afford to neglect. Singularly unfortunate is her attempt to associate 'Dante's moral downfall' with Gemma Donati. What can we say to the suggestion that Dante's wife may have been the Siren of the Dream in *Purg.* xix, and that 'the disenchantment that followed her ravishing song may represent the disillusionment of his married life' (p. 53)? It illustrates the pitfalls that beset even the most conscientious students of the poem

when they yield to the temptation of interpreting an episode without considering its bearing upon the whole work, and it would destroy the entire significance of the dream in the moral system of the *Purgatorio*.

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

LONDON.

Africa di Francesco Petrarca. Edizione critica per cura di NICOLA FESTA, corredata da un ritratto e cinque tavole fuori testo. (*Edizione nazionale delle Opere di Francesco Petrarca*, vol. I.) Firenze: G. C. Sansoni. 4to. lxx + 295 pp. 100 lire.

Saggio sull'Africa del Petrarca. By NICOLA FESTA. (*Biblioteca di scienze e lettere*, CXIII.) Palermo: R. Sandron. 1926 (1927). 8vo. viii + 131 pp. 8 lire.

Petrarch's fame has fluctuated during the ages to an extraordinary degree owing partly to the complexity of his personality, and partly to incomprehension and 'miscomprehension.' His contemporaries admired him mainly as the prince of scholars, as a Latinist 'comparable only to Cicero'; later, when the humanists were inclined to scoff at his learning and style, the vogue of his vernacular poems grew and gave rise to a nerveless imitation. Bembo reacted against such a fashion and studied and imitated the *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta* with the cold intensity of a scholar: Petrarchism, or as one would prefer to say Bembism, held sway for some time and extended into Western Europe, and certain tricks of Petrarch's found special favour with seventeenth-century poets, whilst his achievements in the field of scholarship were almost forgotten. Foscolo was the first intelligently to appreciate his art, laying stress on his Italian poems; then there was launched upon the world the description 'Petrarch, the first man of the Renaissance,' and such tags are perilous for they are partly true, easily remembered and thus readily discourage further thinking. The nineteenth century produced a great deal of Petrarchan criticism and investigation, but with some exceptions, notably with that of de Sanctis, such criticism and investigations were factual and external in character and in scope monographic. Each fact of the poet's life was scrutinised, each aspect of his personality was dissected, each one of his works made the subject of a particular study; but the essential note of this poet so many-sided, the real Petrarch and the whole Petrarch, seemed to evade attention. He seemed to baffle explanation and comprehension precisely because he had striven so hard to make himself intelligible to his readers. What an American critic has said about the author of a recent work: 'he has told everything and the bones of Petrarch lie buried under monumental superfluity,' could as aptly be repeated with regard to the largest part of Petrarchan criticism of the nineteenth century. More recently there have been portents of a more promising future. Gentile gave an admirable conspectus of Petrarch's philosophical thought; V. Benetti-Brunelli analysed the essential parts of his creed; Giani tried to bring out the human and poetic elements in his vernacular lyrics. More recently still Piur drew a

penetrating sketch of Petrarch's personality¹. And all the time there remained a central problem unsolved.

During his life-time Petrarch was held as a literary dictator; rightly or wrongly a movement was considered to have started with him which affected the whole of European culture; he broke away from scholasticism and stood out as the forerunner of an Italian philosophy; if he had not set an example by the indescribable melody of his lyrics, neither Tasso nor Leopardi would have been what they were and are. And precisely the one work which he planned as his masterpiece puzzled his friends when it became known, and has since attracted scant attention. Why?

To begin with, until Corradini's edition became available in 1874, the text was scarcely understandable, and even Corradini has taken unwarranted liberties with the original. It is therefore well fitting that the *Edizione nazionale* of Petrarch's works should start its series of eighteen volumes with the *Africa*, and Professor Festa is to be congratulated on the result of his long labours. His text in conjunction with his essay should go a long way to correct traditional errors of reading and evaluation, although he has been less daring as an editor than he has been acute as a critic. This was perhaps unavoidable for the principles of textual criticism must needs be respected, however strong be the case for believing that some leaves of the autograph have been misplaced. Now at any rate, thanks to the care of Professor Festa, one of the master keys to the understanding of Petrarch is readily accessible.

There are no great novelties in the history of the composition of the *Africa*. It was written between 1338 and 1343; the dedication to King Robert (I, 19-70) must have been inserted about 1341; the lines 421-449 of the ninth book added after Robert's death and before Petrarch's visit to Naples in November 1343²; some of the last lines of the poem may have been added years later. Parts of the poem must have been shown to Robert in 1341 at the eve of the poetical triumph, but only 34 lines were ever circulated by Petrarch (VI, 885-917); two more lines became accidentally known to his friends, but Petrarch always refused to publish his poem and for such a refusal privately gave reasons which Boccaccio at any rate considered exhaustive³. What were these reasons? It seems that it was Petrarch's intention to publish the poem in 1343, but it lacked the last polish. In the autograph, Vergerio its editor assures us, and Tedaldo della Casa's copy shows, that many lines were marked for correction, a fact which is fully consistent with Petrarch's practice as shown by the history of the text of the Italian lyrics. Moreover, there were lacunae. The study of some of these lacunae is perhaps the most illuminating part of Professor Festa's work. Its upshot is that the principal gap may be due to the shuffling of some leaves of the original and the loss of others; the minor gaps corresponding instead partly to lines which the poet cancelled with a view to re-writing them, and partly to short passages which were intended to link up one episode with

¹ See *Mod. Lang. Review*, 1926, p. 331.

² *Saggio*, p. 17.

³ *Africa*, p. xl; *Saggio*, p. 26.

another and which, being considered of little importance, Petrarch left to the last.

It is a most attractive suggestion of the present editor, but one which has not been admitted into the text, that the Palace of Truth, to which reference is made at the beginning of the *Secretum*, should be recognised in the description of III, 87-262. Professor Festa thinks that a few leaves containing parts of books III and IV have been lost and that some of the leaves belonging to bk. III were misplaced and are now printed in bk. IV, which may have contained, besides Laelius' praises of Scipio, Scipio's visit to the Palace of Truth. In bk. IX there are evident and serious lacunae which cannot be remedied; but the other lacunae are probably very short.

Apart from this, one may confidently hold that this edition gives us the features of the original text. Petrarch's was not Augustan Latin; his feeling for prosody was not subtle and delicate as his feeling for vernacular rhythms. Corradini, himself a classical scholar, endeavoured to correct many of Petrarch's slips, a procedure which is in general unjustifiable and particularly wrong in this case, for some of his departure from strict classicism may have been intentional, and we know from Professor Mustard's excellent article¹ that Petrarch altered such lines and metaphors as he took from classical models, a practice which is consistent with his constant aim at originality. It is well known that Magister Anastasius, whoever he was, the author of the *Epistola refragatoria* addressed to Salutati, ascribed Petrarch's unwillingness to publish the *Africa* precisely to his fear of appearing too ready to imitate the classics.

Nowadays scholars are, or at least ought to be, proof against the lure of classicistic emendations, and it is to be hoped that, by perusing the *Africa* as Petrarch wrote it, the readers may be able to appreciate its poetic value despite its linguistic and metric irregularities. By comparing Corradini's with Festa's readings one realises that, for Petrarch as well as for the humanists who did not belong to the Ciceronian school, Latin was a living not a dead language, so living that Petrarch felt no qualms in departing from his cherished models and thus pointed the way to the Latin of later humanists such as Poggio and Pontano. It would be superfluous to enumerate and discuss the new readings, for the critical apparatus makes it certain that they are the original readings such as Vergerio and della Casa transcribed them. Of conjectural emendations there are practically none. Occasionally a suggestion for a probable emendation is made in the notes, and one of them is particularly acute and attractive (I, 318-322).

When Franceschino da Brossano allowed Coluccio and his friends in Florence to have a copy of the poem, their impression was close to disillusionment even though they did not go so far as Poggio who considered it 'ridiculus mus' because in the lapse of a few years their classical taste had become more refined; they were shocked, just as Corradini was, by minor inaccuracies. This explains the lack of favour

¹ W. P. Mustard, *Petrarch's Africa* in *American Journal of Philology*, xlii, 2, no. 168, pp. 97-121, and Festa, *Africa*, p. xlviii; *Saggio*, p. 35.

with which the *Africa* was looked upon by the later humanists from Leonardo Bruni onwards; and once so unfavourable a judgment became established, it was repeated with sheepish docility, as is the practice of scholars no less than of the man in the street. Professor Festa runs counter to this; he shows, and I cannot see that he is carried away by editorial enthusiasm, that the *Africa*, far from being a pedantic imitation of the *Aeneid* and a mere versification of Livy, is a work so grandly conceived as to be well worthy of a great poet, and that it will behove future critics to take the *Africa* in serious consideration in evaluating Petrarch's achievement. Volpi¹ called the *Africa* 'un tentativo fallito'; Canon Tatham 'a failure past all remedy'.² Gaspari, Koerting, Zumbini judge this poem with almost as little favour. They measured it by classical standards and from their own idea of what an epic poem ought to be; but, Professor Festa maintains, Petrarch 'ha voluto fare un poema sui generis'.³ Livy was the basis, but, in following Livy's account, Petrarch took liberties with chronology, and by introducing dreams, visions and meditations, he gained a freedom that Silius Italicus never won for himself. The whole of the eighth book arises from a page in Livy, and the greater section of what remains of the ninth book is profoundly characteristic and should be taken as one of the most interesting among Petrarch's self-revelations: Scipio is speaking with Ennius; the soldier with the poet, the poet asserting his own unworthiness, the soldier asking what the purpose and the scope of poetry are. Ennius, one must remember, is a second Homer and Petrarch a second Ennius. Ennius voices Petrarch's views. Poetry, according to Ennius and Petrarch, must be based on fact and adorn it. If one applies such a theory of art, a theory which postulates allegorical interpretation, to the interpretation of the *Africa*, it appears that Petrarch, by recounting the end of the Punic wars, aimed at illustrating the whole of the long conflict between Rome and Carthage which, from the point of view of a Christian poet, far transcended the question of the control of the Mediterranean sea; Rome's victory was necessary and providentially willed, for imperial Rome was the necessary premise to Christian Rome, the seat of the Christian Church. Dante had spoken 'de l' alta Roma e di suo impero,'

la quale e 'l quale, a voler dir lo vero,
fu stabilito per lo loco santo
u' siede il successor del maggior Piero. (Inf. II. 22.)

Professor Festa does not exploit all the possibilities of his interpretation, but in his suggestive essay he has stated the problem afresh; he shows what Petrarch's aim was in writing the *Africa*, and he has laid before us the *Africa* in a text that it will be difficult to improve upon; these are the data required by de Sanctis for a critical judgment. It is then no exaggeration to say that the correct evaluation of the *Africa*

¹ G. Volpi, *Il Trecento*, Milan, Vallardi, p. 50.

² E. H. R. Tatham, *Francesco Petrarca*, London, 1926, II, p. 183.

³ *Saggio*, p. 76.

begins now, and a study of this poem and its bearing upon Petrarch's personality will necessarily dispel many a preconceived idea. Meanwhile Professor Festa himself promises the publication of a commentary which must anxiously be looked for.

CESARE FOLIGNO.

OXFORD.

Petrarca. Von H. W. EPPELSHEIMER. Bonn: F. Cohen. 1926. viii + 219 pp. 6 M.

The revived interest in Petrarchan studies both in this country and on the continent is exemplified by the recent publication (1926) of Canon Tatham's *Francesco Petrarca* and of the volume now before us—both the fruit of long years of careful study. But while Canon Tatham's two volumes—a third is yet to appear—reach nearly a thousand pages, Dr Eppelsheimer in his mercy tempers his pages to a little over two hundred. The work however is rather an appreciation, an exposition, a criticism of the spiritual, the mental outlook and significance of Petrarch's life and writings in relation to their age than a formal biography. Such biography as is given is treated summarily—a method not without its defects. The identity, even the corporeal reality of the poet's Laura, is one of the most disputed points in Petrarchan studies and to refer to this enigmatical *innamorata* as Frau Laura de Sade *tout court* is to ignore the demolition by Adolfo Bartoli (*Storia d. lett. ital.*, vol. VII, pp. 185–285) of the Abbé de Sade's historical Laura, her identification with a Madame de Sade and the naïve story of the discovery in 1533 of her tomb in Avignon. Dr Eppelsheimer is however concerned with none of these details which are non-essential and treats his theme with philosophical breadth and detachment. After a brief chapter on the poet's life he proceeds to deal with the *Canzoniere*, its influence on the form and spirit of the Italian language and prosody; on Petrarch as the first of the humanists and as the philosopher and moralist. For to his contemporaries Petrarch was universally known, not as a poetical amorist, but as a moralist. He won European fame not by his unworthy trivialities, his *falsis et obscenis muliercularum laudibus*, but as the author of such treatises as the *De contemptu Mundi* written in the maturity of his powers and better known as the *Secretum* (*secretum enim meum es*) which Petrarch regarded as his most important work and which Dr Eppelsheimer rightly dwells on as crowning Petrarch's achievement, 'a monument of the first rank in the history of the human mind.' Petrarch's exemplars are the great Roman Stoic philosophers. In his veneration for Cicero he would that he might be able to hail him, the greatest of Roman moralists, as a catholic, as a Christian Apostle, not as a heathen; and this, not for Cicero's sake, but for the sake of the Christian Church. In succeeding chapters, headed Philosophy, History, Politics, State, Fatherland, a comprehensive criticism is given of Petrarch's relation to the political philosophy and politics of the age. He is the representative man of the century, the first historian in the modern sense in striking contrast to the mediæval ideal as expressed in Dante's *Monarchia*; for the basis of the Dantean

ideal government of the Christian world; to ensure peace and justice under a divinely ordained Holy Roman Emperor and a divinely ordained Pope, had been cut away by Philip the Fair's humiliation of Boniface VIII in 1303 at Anagni and the death in 1313 of the Emperor Henry VII at Buonconvento. Petrarch's ideal, as expressed in his *Africa*, is the republican Rome of the Scipios, a risorgimento of the *virtus romana*. Papacy and Imperium in the mediæval sense are ignored. In the *Divina Commedia* Caesar is placed among the great spirits in the *Nobile Castello*, Brutus consigned with Judas to lowest Hell, to eternal maceration in the bloody slaver of Lucifer's jaws: in the *Africa*, not Caesar but Brutus is exalted. But like Dante's, Petrarch's ideal of peace and good government is a poet's ideal; the inspiration of a vision, *ein schöner Traum aber ein Traum*, though indeed the idealistic Petrarch had a shrewder insight into practical politics as an ambassador of peace between Genoa and Venice than Doge Dondolo himself.

Final chapters, 'Personality and Renaissance,' deal with Petrarch's importance as the first modern man, the first self-sufficing, independent individual (*cum et ego unus sum, utinamque integer*)—self-centred, aiming at the development and perfecting of his own talents and powers. Dr Eppelsheimer is not satisfied with the conventional conception of Petrarch as the Father of the Renaissance, the Moses who led in Italy the Exodus from the bondage of mediæval scholasticism. He is the prophet of nationality, of the revolution which, from the Renaissance to the Reformation, inaugurated the modern age—the herald of Humanism, Renaissance and Modern Europeanism. Dr Eppelsheimer's use of terms such as Democracy, Sovereignty of the People, is to be deprecated as misleading when applied to thirteenth-century conditions in Italian communes. The Italian commune and specifically that of Florence was a middle-class autocracy of bankers, traders, professional men and master-craftsmen—a 'Mittelstanddemocratie' as Davidsohn more correctly terms it. Dr Eppelsheimer has written a scholarly, suggestive contribution to Petrarchan studies.

T. OKEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

Studies of the Spanish Mystics. By E. ALLISON PEERS. Vol. I. London: The Sheldon Press. 1927. 8vo. xvii + 471 pp. 18s. net.

In two chapters of this book Professor Allison Peers is a pioneer: of the seven mystics of his first volume of *Studies*, two, Osuna and Fray Juan de los Angeles, are completely unknown to English readers. Of the other five, St Ignatius of Loyola and Santa Teresa have been well known in England since the seventeenth century, while Luis de Leon and St John of the Cross are slightly better known and Fray Luis de Granada is considerably more neglected than of old. When the last English translation of Granada appeared in 1869, after a continuous vogue of three hundred years, only a few lyrics of Leon had been rendered into English and none of his prose; the complete English

translation of the works of St John of the Cross by David Lewis had appeared only five years before, in 1864. It is unlikely that two artists so overwhelmingly great both in verse and prose will be again allowed to undergo total eclipse in the country of Vaughan and Crashaw and Blake. Professor Peers points to William Habington's poem 'When I survey the bright celestial sphere' as a curious resemblance if not an actual imitation of the 'Noche Serena.' To his elaborate bibliography must be added Professor Entwistle's article on Leon's lyrics in the *Modern Language Review* of January and April, 1927, and a Dutch translation of *La Perfecta Casada* by P. Lissone Wierdels, published at Amsterdam in 1925.

There have been no greater mystics than St Teresa and St John of the Cross:

Teresa, soul of fire;
John of the Cross, spirit of ardent flame!

Here the subject might well run away with the author, but Professor Peers admirably keeps a due proportion (they have but 150 pages out of 400) as he likewise preserves a careful balance between their importance as incomparable artists and their spiritual significance. The two aspects cannot of course be separated. To Spanish literature all these mystics are of inestimable value because they moulded the language to an inner intensity and all the shades and subtleties of psychology and emotion, making of words not an external defence and barrier of brilliant effect but a living immediate expression. With them language becomes the very sheath of the soul. Yet Huysmans could speak of St Teresa's 'iron tulips': 'un lys métallique, forgé de fer.' That is what none of these mystics ever was, what no real mystic could ever become; they were transfigured in the crucible of suffering but never hardened into unreality nor lost their exquisite sensitiveness.

One can dismiss the lyrics of St John of the Cross as a miracle; but an earthly explanation is only possible on the assumption that he possessed a sensitive love of Nature and feeling for the beauty of the world around him, a sensitiveness which was fused and sublimated in his mystic song. It would be as misleading to think of him as soaring heavenward without roots on earth as to deny sublimity to Luis de Leon because he is so direct and personal and more often expresses his sense of the beauty of common things. Professor Peers is possibly inclined to consider the Carmelite saint as a miraculous lily that has not developed and grown out of the earth and to give less than its real value to his love of Nature; for it was surely a living part of his mysticism, a constant witness to the beauty of the presence of God. His almost inhuman genius is fed with a concentration of earthly flowers. Professor Peers finds Luis de Leon lacking in the sublime (p. 323). It is, of course, true that St John of the Cross is far the greater mystic of the two, although it is not very safe to affirm that Leon had no mystic system without examining his *In Cantica Canticorum* (in its definitive third edition) more closely than has here been done; it is of vastly more

importance than the perfectly unmystical *La Perfecta Casada*, to which a whole page has been devoted.

It would require a review of very many pages to describe adequately the admirable contents of this first volume. It is to be followed by another dealing with another batch from among that resplendent army of Spanish mystics who sprang out of the materialism and unrest of the sixteenth century. As to some of these writers the question arises whether they were mystics in the strictest sense of the word; but, fortunately for his readers, Professor Peers takes the larger view.

AUBREY F. G. BELL.

S. JOÃO DO ESTORIL, PORTUGAL.

Walahfrids deutsche Glossierung zu den biblischen Büchern Genesis bis Regum II und der althochdeutsche Tatian. VON ERNST SCHRÖTER. (*Hermaea*, XVI.) Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1926. 204 pp. 12 M.

Die Bücherei von St Gallen und das althochdeutsche Schrifttum. VON HEINRICH BRAUER. (*Hermaea*, XVII.) Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1926. xii + 103 pp. 5 M. 60.

The first of these volumes is a continuation, both in matter and in method, of two articles by Georg Baesecke in the *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* (vols. LVIII and LXI). In these articles Baesecke examines the German glosses to Genesis of the *Rz family, and shows that they are one and the same work—the differences being due to changes made by various copyists—and probably represent a part of a German biblical commentary which is to be ascribed to Walahfrid. Schröter examines the glosses to the other biblical books in the same manner, and reconstructs the *Urtext* *PSg, from which the Cod. S. Pauli xxv d/82 on the one hand, and Cod. S. Galli 9 with its descendants on the other, come. *PSg is shown to be a compilation, and not an original work; it is indebted mainly to Reichenau and Old English sources. The compiler changes the Upper German and Old English forms into those of his own (East Franconian) language, e.g. *folpuazza* > *folpuozza* and *crop* > *chroph*; he retains Old English words only when his own language contained no corresponding word (e.g. *felefor*); of Alemannic there remains only 'eine leise Färbung.'

Schröter then shows that Cod. S. Galli 283 (the work of Walahfrid) is really a preliminary form of *PSg, and suggests that Walahfrid must be regarded as the author of *PSg too, since new work in *PSg shows the same method of using the sources as Cod. S. Galli 283. Both must have been written during Walahfrid's sojourn in Reichenau.

A comparative analysis of *PSg and the γ section of the Old High German Tatian translation shows that the translation of this section of Tatian appears to be Walahfrid's work, and must have been made in the period of Walahfrid's banishment. This hypothesis is based on such a careful analysis of the language of the whole material and of the various traditions which have come down to us that it must be regarded as highly probable, if not established.

The second part of the book (pp. 151-204) contains, as a continuous text, a reconstruction of Walahfrid's biblical glosses from Genesis to II Kings, and an attempt is made to show the stages of its development. Schröter's work is a real and valuable contribution to our knowledge of Old High German.

The second of these books is based on the material supplied by the first volume of the *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge* (München, 1918), and its object is to show the part played by the St Gallen library in the development of Old High German literature. The author's method is to describe how this famous library was built up step by step, and to show the relation of the German work to the non-German work. He discusses the various catalogues which have come down to us, points out the difficulties in interpreting certain descriptions, such as 'libri scottice scripti,' for example, and warns us that an omission need not necessarily imply that a given work was not in the library at a given time—it may have been privately owned, and thus not entered in any list until long after its acquisition. Brauer then deals with the growth of the library in three periods: from the beginnings till 841, from 841 till 900, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, and, by classifying the works in a convenient way, shows what additions were made in each period in biblical books, patristic literature, German glossaries and translations, the Latin classics, and so on. St Gallen's debt to other countries is also made clear.

The book concludes with two indexes, one of manuscripts, and the other of authors and works. These indexes occupy thirteen pages, and are compiled carefully and arranged clearly, thus adding to the value of the volume as a book of reference.

A. C. DUNSTAN.

LONDON.

Strindberg's dramer. AV MARTIN LAMM. 2 vols. Stockholm: A. Bonnier. 1924, 1926. 412 and 446 pp. 8 kr. 50 and 9 kr.

It is a little strange that, fifteen years after his death, still so little scholarly attention has been directed to the work of the last of the great European Scandinavians. Of journalistic writing about Strindberg there has, of course, been enough, and more than enough; and there are two excellent Swedish biographies of Strindberg, the discursive and rather loosely put together one by Nils Erdmann (1920) and the more concise and attractive work by E. Hedén (1922), and a few helpful monographs of biographical and literary interest. But I think it may be said that Strindberg's abnormal psychological temperament and mental derangement have evoked a more serious interest—and that mainly in scientific and medical circles—than his work as a man of letters. And yet surely these sixty volumes of his *Samlade skrifter* provide a richer quarry for the student of literature than the output of any other great writer of our time.

One reason for this seeming reluctance to come to grips with Strindberg's literary production has, no doubt, been the formidable difficulties

of the task. Strindberg is an extraordinarily, even forbiddingly, original writer. Whereas in the case of other men, the reader is, as it were, gently led up to their originality through phases of imitative experiment under influence from without, he feels in the case of the great Swede somewhat like a mariner who has to commence his voyage, not by sailing down a gently opening estuary, but must at once launch out into the open—and with Strindberg, it may be added, unusually stormy—sea.

What makes these two admirable volumes of Professor Lamm's so valuable and enlightening to us is that they offer just what we need in the matter of guidance. He introduces us to Strindberg's dramatic work by placing it for us in the perspective of its time. In respect especially of form and technique Strindberg is little dependent upon models. The student of Ibsen, for instance, may follow in that writer a gradual development of his art from his Scribe-influenced beginnings in the Bergen days, through his indebtedness to the Danish Romantic drama, to the Augier technique which was ultimately to develop into the originality of his latest phase. There is none of this gradual development in Strindberg; he emerges with *Mäster Olof* as a dramatist of the first rank, fully panoplied. When in the eighties he turned to naturalism he began by producing *Fröken Julie* and *Faderen*, both dramas which, so far from being regarded by their contemporaries as following in the wake of the French leaders of the movement, were felt to have opened up a new phase of realistic development. They cannot be lumped with *Thérèse Raquin* and the products of the Théâtre libre; this was a more consistent, more ruthless realism than had yet been attempted, and a realism which gradually led over to that extraordinary fusion of realism and symbolic expressionism of Strindberg's later dramas. I should have liked Professor Lamm to emphasise, even more than he has done, the essential newness of Strindberg's interpretation of naturalism. The same revolutionary originality is to be seen in Strindberg's romantically unromantic fairy and symbolic dramas; and again in the expressionism—so different from that of the German theatre in the new century—of the *Till Damascus* period. Most important of all, I cannot help thinking, are the great historical dramas of Strindberg's last years; nothing he has left us is calculated to have so renovating and fertilising an influence on the future drama of Europe—unless the evolution of the cinematograph and wireless radio is to make the theatre a thing of the past. For here in these works, Strindberg has given us a new technique of the presentation of history in the theatre, a technique as revolutionary, and more immediately practicable than that of Hebbel fifty years before him. The intrusion of Strindberg's own personality and idiosyncrasies into the historic picture is often, it is true, a disturbing enough factor; but if we regarded these dramas purely from the standpoint of technique and method, they suggest great possibilities. The phase initiated by *Fröken Julie* has had its day; the day of the later historical dramas is still to come.

Side by side with this originality of method, we find in Strindberg a writer particularly sensitive to the ideas of his age; his receptivity

in this respect is almost as remarkable as his lack of it where aesthetic form and technique are concerned. His whole intellectual life is a kaleidoscopic reflection of the ideas that agitated the European mind—with the proviso that the more extravagant and conflicting these ideas were, the surer they were of receiving from him a sympathetic hearing. Here indeed Strindberg's works do reflect the movement of his time in a high degree, from his early interest in Kierkegaard and Buckle, as manifested in *Mäster Olof*, through political radicalism, anti-feminism, French mysticism and occultism, to Nietzscheism. Where it seems to me we can learn most from Professor Lamm's work is from his co-ordination of Strindberg's intellectual evolution and the reflection of that evolution in the long series of his dramas; he has provided us with the ground lines of Strindberg's development on the basis of his intellectual growth; he has found the *raison d'être* of his always changing dramatic form in the extraordinary vicissitudes of his storm-tossed life. Thus his book is more than a mere study of Strindberg's dramas; it is a closely woven history of his spiritual development, demonstrated on that literary form to which he always remained most faithful.

J. G. ROBERTSON.

LONDON.

Grammar of Early Welsh. By JOSEF BAUDIŠ. Part I. Phonology. (Philological Society, *Philologica*, vol. II, Supplement.) London: H. Milford. 1924. viii + 178 pp. 15s.

This is a laborious and difficult undertaking, and its shortcomings should not be judged too severely. The arrangement of the matter is lucid, and it is easy to find one's way about in the pithy sections, but alas, they bristle with wrong and disputable etymologies, mostly of the uncircumspect than the really bad kind. A large number of useful vocables have been brought together, but the lack of a preliminary chronology of sources makes them perilous material to work on for those who do not know the early sources at first hand. An entire overhauling of the manuscript sources, and a new dating by competent historians are urgently needed for Welsh linguistic studies. In the course of the long three-cornered fight for and against a Welsh metropolitan, between Urban of Llandaff, Bernard of St David's, and Geoffrey of Monmouth in collusion with Robert the Duke, there was a flourishing industry in pseudo-antiques, of which Harley 3859 and the *Historia Regum Britanniae* are shining examples, to say nothing of the impossible Llandaff *Vitae* and charters, and the *Vita Kentigerni*; the last forged at Llancarvan and involved in the York-Glasgow squabble. Not only is there a complication of dates caused by forged documents, but a complication of languages too, for the marks of a Breton scribe are obvious in a source like the Welsh *Privilegium* of Teilo, written up after 1119, as well as in the early lingua-franca glosses between Wales and Brittany. It was only to be expected that the Norman ecclesiastical politicians of the Latin Church in South Wales would use Breton monks for writing up

Welsh historical fiction and forging charters for production at the Vatican. All Welsh texts emanating from the twelfth-century Latin Church need suspicious scrutiny.

Besides a dating of early sources by specialists in the early history of the Latin Church in Wales, a revision of the phonology is long overdue. Some of the so-called sound-laws are clearly established by frequent occurrence in different combinations, and invariability; others again are only tentative surmises founded on inadequate or irregular examples at a time when Welsh philologists were fumbling their way along. The older school knew perfectly well which were sound and which were risky, but the younger philologists seem to be unable to discriminate, and lump both categories as reliable bases of inference, with the inevitable result of adding to the vast rubbish heap on the wayside of linguistic progress.

Professor Baudiš could give valuable help to philologists in cognate groups, who want to use Welsh, if he were to mark out the soundly established laws, and warn against those inferred from inadequate or uncertain data; and it is to be hoped that he will do so in his next volume. The errors in this work will no doubt be reviewed at length in one of the Celtic periodicals, and there is no need to discuss them in detail here.

J. GLYN DAVIES.

LIVERPOOL.

La Méthode Comparative en Linguistique Historique. Par A. MEILLET. (Institutet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning, Series A, II.) Oslo: H. Aschehoug. 1925. viii + 116 pp.

Mankind, Nation and Individual from a Linguistic Point of View. By O. JESPERSEN. (Inst. for Sammenlign. Kulturforskning, Series A, IV.) Oslo: H. Aschehoug. 1925. 221 pp. 6 Kr. 50.

The important 'Norwegian Institut for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning' has opened its series of publications of lectures delivered before it with important contributions to general linguistics by Meillet and Jespersen. Meillet opens with a clear account of the uses and limitations of the comparative method in the search for general principles and establishment of historical facts. The wide sweep of his knowledge of Indo-European languages, especially of the near East, enables him to give a masterly demonstration of the at first sight hardly believable concordance of the Armenian *erku* with Skt. *dvā*, pp. 107 ff., a veritable triumph of delicately controlled comparison. As against this he shows the impossibility of reconstructing hypothetically a system like the Latin case-system from a mere comparison of the Romance languages without reference to the extant Latin texts; but for the latter we should be completely baffled by a petrifact like *rien* < *rēm*. But again, we are shown how the morphological system or patterning is more resistant to change than the phonology and vocabulary. Especially the conjugation of the verb maintains old distinctions, which only gradually become obscured through generalisations (on p. 49 Irish might be added to

Armenian as generalising -m in the 1st sing. pres.). Unlike Jespersen, Meillet does not reject the substratum theory, and the reviewer is glad to have independent confirmation from so high an authority for a view he had himself suggested in University lectures, viz. that linguistic 'drift,' causing parallel developments in cognate languages after their separation or producing in an acquired language (Latin) changes apparently analogous to those subsequently undergone by the language of the substratum elsewhere preserved, is perhaps due to the inheritance of certain habits and facilitations, or—if that sounds too fanciful—to the latent inheritance and occasional atavism of the physical mechanisms best adapted for the expression of those characteristic habits. Sometimes the apparently delayed action of 'drift,' e.g. Umlaut in the Germanic languages after their separation, is perhaps due to the lag of the written behind the spoken form in regard to the notation of minimal sound-shifts. In other cases, e.g., possibly the alleged influence of Gaulish on Vulgar Latin, the manifestation of the 'drift' after a period of time may be due to the late appearance in literary texts of a section of the population continuously handing on and developing certain characteristic phenomena of the substratum.

We are still left with the stubborn problem of the initiation of sound-change, and must choose between unconscious collective and practically simultaneous innovation (Meillet, p. 85) and the individual as originator and broadcaster (Jespersen, *Mankind*, pp. 28 ff.). Behind the empirical formulae of specific sound-changes, Meillet (p. 86), in common with Güntert and Noreen, describes certain general types of change, which, however, represent possibilities rather than necessities (p. 91).

Next, the conditions of dialect-formation and dialect-destruction are handled in Chapter vi. On reading of all that has been accomplished in mapping dialects on the Continent, one cannot help wishing that the Celtic populations of Britain would put some of their energetic patriotism into providing us with adequate linguistic atlases of their local *parlers* before it is too late (cf. the article on Welsh dialect study by Alf Sommerfelt, translated by Iorwerth Peate into Welsh: *Astudio tafodieithoedd Cymru in Cymru*, August, 1925).

Protagonists of an international language will be encouraged by Meillet's statement on p. 20 concerning the 'anomaly' of the multiplication of 'common languages' in the Europe of to-day with its unified civilisation. Those who refuse all truck with 'artificial' forms of language may ponder the remarks on the Serbo-Croat grammarian Vuk (p. 77). All philologists without exception may take to heart Meillet's exhortation: 'il importe de préciser, de systématiser et d'étendre les recherches.' I have a feeling that Dr Sampson's great work on the dialect of the Gypsies of Wales would fulfil all these demands to Meillet's satisfaction and points the way for such investigations in the future.

Of more varied content, Jespersen's lectures are marked by that decisiveness of outlook and robust common-sense to which the author has long accustomed us. He refuses to apotheosise 'language' as opposed to individual speech-habits, or the 'community' as opposed to the

individual in the inception of speech-change. He gets under Gauchat's guard by reinterpreting his evidence. In his review of the geographical factors conditioning dialect-formation he ascribes to forest-belts a greater importance than to rivers and mountains (p. 42). Being fully aware of the strong set towards levelling and unification between linguistic groups, he rebuts the fatalistic view that the only direction taken by linguistic development is towards an 'infinite variety.' Against Terracher and van Ginneken he attaches less weight to parental influence on children's speech than to the school and playmates; thus he discounts the alleged effects of exogamy on the local dialects (pp. 48 ff.). Judiciously assessing the standardising factors, he discusses the importance of literature, of the touring companies of actors and especially of centralised government. Military service and the drainage of the rural population into the towns hasten the levelling (cf. the statistics showing the provenance of the population of Copenhagen, p. 65). For the Received Standard in England he insists upon the paramount importance of London (p. 68) and the University towns. To those who deplore the recession of the dialects in view of their rich expressiveness and subtle shadings he administers consolation by indicating the still greater wealth and subtlety of the standard; but many will not be comforted. He next views 'standards of correctness' from all possible angles (authority, usage of particular localities, literature, class-consciousness, conformity with logic, satisfaction of aesthetic demands). The grades of excellence are, in ascending order, intelligibility, correctness and goodness, this latter comporting clearness and beauty and leading us to a study of Style. Not only individual utterances, but whole languages can be judged on these lines. Jespersen does not like the display of social inequalities in oriental languages like Japanese and Javanese and finds fault with such languages as Swedish which use a title in preference to the 2nd person pronoun. In the chapter on Slang he gives some telling examples of the manner of its formation and the objects upon which it fastens, its curtailments and extensions of word-forms, its rhyming additions (e.g. *un peu, mon neveu!*) etc. He distinguishes slang from thieves' language (perhaps best called *cant*), vulgarisms and 'shop' jargons. He follows the mystical and esoteric traits of language across the globe from Australia to Greenland; the eccentric habit of threading long strings of meaningless, but weird-sounding words is illustrated from the Snorra Edda, and the concealment-languages of our schoolboys are provided with a parallel from the Maoris.

The concluding chapter adverts to the distinction of 'historically related' and 'primordially related' (Jespersen prefers 'naturally common'), used by Schuchardt, and to the doctrine of monogenesis championed by Trombetti. Jespersen holds fast to the fundamental unity of mankind and points out that the small physiological variations from race to race have never been proved to cause linguistic difference. Finally, though expressing his scepticism as to the universal general laws in language, which Grammont claimed to have discovered, he agrees that whole series of changes both in sound and meaning may recur independently

in many separate communities and periods; here he would seem to meet Meillet. In our own time we find a convergence of vocabulary due to participation in a common civilisation. Jespersen firmly maintains the view that the growing community of ideas is the justification for the furtherance of an International Language to subserve man's wider needs, while his mother-tongue remains his most intimate and hallowed possession.

W. E. COLLINSON.

LIVERPOOL.

SHORT NOTICES

We hail with gratitude the appearance of vol. VI of *The Year's Work in English Studies*, edited for the English Association by F. S. Boas and C. H. Herford (London: H. Milford. 7s. 6d.) and congratulate the editors and the Association on the valuable assistance given them by a number of distinguished collaborators. This volume deals with the productions of the year 1925. The writers of the different sections are generally the same as those of the preceding volume, but Professor Abercrombie is replaced by Professor Herford in 'Literary History and Criticism,' Professor E. V. Gordon by Miss Dorothy Everett in 'Middle English' and Dr A. W. Reed by Sir Edmund Chambers in 'Shakespeare.' In each section we still have the year's work in a particular domain reviewed and criticised by a master-hand. It is to be hoped that the value of the publication is becoming increasingly recognized both at home and abroad. The only criticism I have to offer is a trifling one. There is some inconsistency in the distribution of titles such as 'Professor' and 'Dr,' especially where foreigners are concerned. 'Mr Tanner' (p. 216) should be 'Dr Tanner,' 'Herr F. Brie' (p. 199) is Professor Brie of Freiburg, 'H. Weyhe' and 'Luick' (p. 39) are Professors Weyhe of Halle and Luick of Vienna, 'Dr Hans Hecht of Göttingen' (p. 114) is Professor Hecht, while Mr Praz of Liverpool appears on p. 219 as 'Professor Praz' rather as a tribute to his deserts than as a statement of fact. Might not the best course be to omit titles all round?

G. C. M. S.

That useful annual, the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, although the 1925 volume is rather belated, seems, in the hands of Professor W. Keller, to be now re-established much on its pre-war lines, but a little shorn of its pre-war amplitude. About a third of the space of the above volume (Band LXI. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz. 192 pp.) is devoted to reviews and a chronicle of theatrical productions. The festival address to the German *Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* was on *Shakespeare und die Mode des Tags*, by Eugen Kilian, a veteran scholar, whose regretted death is recorded. The most interesting of the general articles is a study by A. Eichler of *Das Hofbühnenmässige in Shakespeares Midsummer Night's Dream*. G. von Glasenapp brings psycho-physiology to bear upon his interpretation of Banquo's ghost, and H. Turck discusses the philosophy of Hamlet's reflections on the skull of Yorick. F. Schnapp gives an account of some

criticisms of Shakespeare by Franz Liszt, and M. Schütt considers the possibility of a knowledge of his plays by Calderón. She finds a comparison between *Henry VIII* and *La Cisma de Inglaterra* inconclusive. A. Gultmann makes a gallant attempt to diagnose the malady of the poet's later days as arterio-sclerosis.

E. K. C.

The Beginnings of English Literary Periodicals, A Study of Periodical Literature 1665-1715 (New York: Oxford University Press; London: H. Milford. viii + 92 pp. 11s. 6d.), by Professor Walter Graham of the Western Reserve University, is a useful sketch of a subject which as yet has received little attention. The first chapter, entitled 'The Learned Periodical,' deals with the English successors of *Le Journal des Savans* and in particular with the work of De la Crose and John Dunton; the second, entitled 'The Periodical of Amusement,' is mainly concerned with such publications as Edward Ward's *London Spy* and other ventures, Motteux's *Gentleman's Journal*, and the 'Scandal Club' section of Defoe's *Weekly Review*; then follows a brief chapter on 'Some Critics and Reformers,' preparatory to the final chapter on *The Tatler* and *The Spectator* and their imitators and contemporaries. Altogether, about a hundred periodicals are named or described in about eighty pages. The book has manifestly been rigidly condensed, and might be described as a survey or guide rather than a study. But it is the best-informed guide that we yet have to the literary periodical, as distinct from the newspaper, during the reigns of William III and Anne. We are given many details that are not to be found in any of the older accounts or lists (use has been made, for instance, of unpublished manuscripts in the Rawlinson collection in the Bodleian Library); and all is arranged to show the steady development of the diverging and converging forms of journalism which took shape as the periodical essay, the magazine, and the review. The subject has been frequently dealt with in university dissertations, and some of us had expected that the authoritative treatise would have been published by now. Professor Graham's book is somewhat slight; but it is good.

D. N. S.

In *Englische Rokoko-Epik* (Munich: Max Hueber. 1927. 110 pp.) Professor F. Brie of Freiburg claims with much force that we should recognise in English literature of the early eighteenth century the appearance of a *genre*, original to this country, the rococo-epic, represented primarily by Pope's *Rape of the Lock* and Gay's *Fan*. It is an inadequate account of these works to call them social satires or mock-heroic poems. They have something which is not purely satirical or burlesque, an absorbing interest in the little luxuries of life, especially of the life of fashionable women. They are suggested by the papers of Addison and Steele in the *Tatler* and *Spectator* in which feminine foibles are satirised so gently that one feels that the writers would not wish women to be very different from what they are. In them, too, as in the poets, one sees a certain pride in the achievements of British trade which have brought so many costly articles from all parts of the world to serve the purposes of a woman's vanity. Meanwhile, in all we see English

Puritanism side by side with English commercialism, so that a touch of condemnation is generally present, and 'rococo' in England is never so purely artistic and irresponsible a thing as in France. A swarm of forgotten poems of the type of *The Rape of the Lock* and *The Fan* followed in England and the *genre* spread to France and to Germany where little rococo-epics appeared in profusion between 1740 and 1775.

Professor Brie shows a remarkable knowledge of the whole movement. He makes a slip perhaps when he says (p. 19) 'Nach 1700 beginnt man Shakespeares Tragödien mit Gesang und Tanz zu geben'—the musical additions to *Macbeth* were much earlier. On p. 55 'Calprenèdes "Cassandra und Cleopatra"' suggests that one romance is in question, and not two.

G. C. M. S.

Recent American literature is well illustrated by Professor Walther Fischer of Giessen in *Amerikanische Prosa vom Bürgerkrieg bis auf die Gegenwart (1863-1922)* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1926. viii + 256 pp. 8 M.). Dr Fischer spent many years in the United States and his Introduction on the history of political, philosophical and literary tendencies in America during the last sixty years is of great value. In the well-chosen specimens which follow, politics is represented by Lincoln, Lowell, Carl Schurz, Booker Washington, Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, philosophy by Emerson, Walt Whitman, William James and Joseph Royce, the 'American language' by Brander Matthews, the short story by Bret Harte, Mark Twain, Cable, Harris ('Uncle Remus'), Bierce and O. Henry, the novel by Howells, Henry James, M. Deland, etc., to Sinclair Lewis and Dos Passos, the essay by Higginson, Bliss Perry, Mencken and Spingarn. Difficulties of language are explained in footnotes, and a short life is given of each author. The book could hardly be better of its kind. But why do German scholars persist in the confusing habit of calling the Church of England 'die Hochkirche'?

G. C. M. S.

Le Rôle du Surnaturel dans les Chansons de Geste, by Adolphe Jacques Dickman (Paris: E. Champion. 1926. xii + 208 pp.) is a doctor's thesis presented in 1925 to the Graduate College of the State University of Iowa. The author aims at giving a more complete account than is to be found in existing monographs of the supernatural element in the *Chansons de Geste*, differentiating between 'le merveilleux' and 'le surnaturel religieux ou chrétien,' and showing their relative importance in the history of this literary *genre*. His definition of the supernatural as that which at any given period cannot be explained by the science of the time seems to demand as a basis for his study an adequate account of the scientific knowledge of the age where it touches his material. Reference is made to the lapidaries of the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and the contemporary chroniclers' stories of the marvellous are instanced as parallels to similar things in the *Chansons de Geste*, but these and similar references are hardly sufficient. The bestiaries are not mentioned, for instance, and the author does not seem to be acquainted with any general work dealing with this aspect of his subject more recent than Garinet's *Histoire de la Magie en France*, 1818,

and Salverte's *Les Sciences occultes*, 1829. One notes the absence from the bibliography of such an important work as Thorndike's *History of Magic and Experimental Science during the first Thirteen Centuries of our Era*, and of Langlois, *La Connaissance de la Nature et du Monde au moyen âge*. With this broader basis M. Dickman's conclusions would probably have gained in precision and importance; as it is, they appear rather thin, in proportion to the pains taken to classify the large amount of material—fifty-six poems—with which he deals. C. I. W.

With the *Gramática de la Lengua Castellana, Muestra de la Istoria de las Antigüedades de España, Reglas de Orthographia en la Lengua Castellana* of Nebrija (London: H. Milford. 1926. lxii + 272 pp. 18s.) the Professor of Spanish in the University of Belfast, Dr González Llubera, commences his edition of the more significant works of that great dominie who brought Humanism to Spain. We have here the text of the first Castilian grammar (from Walberg's facsimile) and the treatises on Antiquities and Orthography, scrupulously edited. A fully documented introduction outlines the biography of the author and discusses the critical problems of his curious orthography, while the notes (to the *Gramática* alone) confront Nebrija with his sources, the Roman grammarians. These are his ultimate sources; his immediate debt to his Italian teachers, particularly to Tortelli, the editor reserves for discussion when the publication of texts gives a better basis for discussion (see *Bulletin of Spanish Studies*, iv, 1927, pp. 89–92). Professor Llubera treats with the same reserve the question of Nebrija's character as a scholar and his influence on later Spanish humanists. The *Repetitiones*, in particular, should give definition to a number of points which are not clearly discussed in the three treatises published. Any alert reader of the *Gramática* and the *Antigüedades* will find in this volume matter of interest, and the beginnings of far-reaching judgments on Spanish Humanism in its national and international aspects; but it would be well for the reviewer to respect the editor's self-imposed reserve in critical matters. He may, however, express his appreciation of Professor Llubera's act in publishing with an English firm the first instalment of a work of such indubitable importance.

W. J. E.

Of all the later Middle High German court poets Konrad von Würzburg has the greatest interest for the modern reader. He stands at the parting of the ways, in respect of art looking back to the great age of mediæval German poetry as exemplified by his revered master Gottfried von Strassburg, and in form pointing to the coming technicalities of the *Meistergesang*. Of late years he has met with the well-deserved critical attention of German scholars: Paul Gereke set the ball rolling in 1912 with his edition of *Engelhard*, Konrad's masterpiece; and E. Schröder, whose *Studien zu Konrad von Würzburg* (1911, 1916) showed him to be one of the most discerning of Konrad scholars, gave us in 1924 a very welcome and valuable edition of the *Kleinere Dichtungen*, and in 1926 of the *Goldene Schmiede*, which is not only a model of critical acumen, but typographically a delight to the eye. Now we are promised a

complete edition of the *Legenden*, edited by Paul Gereke, of which the first and second (of three) volumes have appeared (*Altdeutsche Textbibliothek*, xix, xx. Halle: M. Niemeyer. x + 156 pp. and xv + 63 pp. 2 M. 80 and 1 M. 80). We hope that some equally competent scholar will present us with modern editions of *Partonopier* and the *Trojanerkrieg*, though it will need a bold man to tackle the 40,000 odd verses of the latter epic. It is high time, however, that the lesser known poems of Konrad were made more readily accessible. We welcome this edition of *Silvester*, which has not been reprinted since Grimm first published it in 1841. In a sense this neglect is not unmerited: the poem was written to order for one of Konrad's ecclesiastical patrons (later a bishop of Basel), and it is difficult to grow warm over this quasi-literal rendering of the ancient Latin legend of Pope Silvester and his disputation with the twelve sages of Jewry, each of whom he routs in turn. Even Konrad's contemporaries found the poem dull, to judge from the fact that it has only been preserved in a single manuscript, although, it is true, several other Middle High German versions of the legend are extant. Moreover, *Silvester* belongs to the earliest works of the poet and betrays poverty of technique as well as of inspiration. The legend of Saint Alexis, which forms the contents of the second volume, is of greater interest, if only because of the ramifications of the story in most of the vernaculars of mediæval Europe: of these the Norman *Vie de Saint Alexis* is the earliest and most famous example. It was time that the imperfect edition of Henczyski (1898) was superseded by a more critical text. That the editor has performed his task conscientiously and well there is little need to add; no less could be expected of a nephew of the late Hermann Paul. It is in every respect worthy of the admirable series in which it appears and we shall look forward with interest to the final volume.

L. A. W.

The thirty-ninth volume of the *Schriften der Goethe-Gesellschaft* contains *Herders Briefwechsel mit Caroline Flachsland*, I. August, 1770—December, 1771, edited from the manuscripts in the possession of the Goethe- and Schiller-Archiv by Hans Schauer (Weimar: Verlag der Goethe-Gesellschaft. 1926. xvi + 484 pp.). Some two-thirds of the present volume have been already printed in the Herder biographical literature of seventy and more years ago—and then often very inaccurately; the second volume of this edition, containing the letters down to Herder's marriage with Caroline in 1773, promises a greater proportion of hitherto unpublished matter. Apart from the value of these 82 letters for Herder's personality and development, they form an interesting contribution to the psychology of the sentimental age that delighted in *Werthers Leiden*; the views of lovers on books and poetry—from their first difference of opinion about Lessing's *Minna von Barnhelm* to their common delight in Sophie von Laroche's *Fräulein von Sternheim*, a work which evokes less equivocal enthusiasm than Richardson's *Clarissa*—hold the mirror up to contemporary taste. The student particularly interested in Herder's attitude to Shakespeare and

English literature will find a good deal of material here. It is interesting to note that Herder, in the letters written while he was undergoing his operation in Strassburg, never mentions Goethe—only, indeed, in the last of the letters here printed does Caroline refer to 'Ihr Freund Gede.' The epoch-making meeting of Herder with his younger admirer does not seem to have made a corresponding impression on the older man.

J. G. R.

Professor Camillo von Klenze's *From Goethe to Hauptmann* (New York: The Viking Press. 1926. 321 pp. \$ 2.50) is a series of five essays in comparative literature. The first discusses various interpretations of Italy down to the twentieth century; its criticism of little-known travel-books is valuable, although the connexion with Goethe implied in the title of the essay is not very close. The second essay is a continuation, and deals with the growth of interest in the early Italian masters and the German predecessors of Ruskin. A not very profound, though interesting discussion of the realistic and romantic elements in the work of Gottfried Keller and C. F. Meyer is followed by studies of naturalism in the German drama from Schiller to Hauptmann, and of Hauptmann's attitude to the lower classes. In the last essay, which extends to fifty-three pages, Hauptmann's name is barely mentioned in the first forty-two; but the attitude of English and continental writers to the urban and the rural poor is broadly discussed, the legend of the 'noble labourer' or 'noble peasant' being linked up with the eighteenth century's conception of the 'noble savage' and the development of the idea by Hauptmann.

The volume is evidently intended to make a popular appeal, as the titles of German books are given in English, while French quotations are untranslated. It would have been better, however, to quote Heine's poem on the Silesian weavers in German or in English prose, instead of in Untermeyer's execrable version, not the least of whose offences is the rhyme 'coffin' and 'soften.' There are a number of infelicitous expressions, such as 'Hebbelese' and 'the Sage of Weimar,' while it is rather startling to read that the relentless elision of the superfluous makes one of C. F. Meyer's stories resemble a racehorse in training. The author has made his essays just sufficiently technical to interest the lay reader, and the book is clearly the product of considerable, if discursive, industry. The bibliography is excellent.

W. R.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

March-May, 1927

GENERAL.

- BAILEY, J., *A Question of Taste* (Engl. Assoc. Pamphlets, lxv). London, H. Milford. 2s. 6d.
- BEAUMONT, C. W., *The History of Harlequin*. London, C. W. Beaumont. 42s.
- Chicago, University of. *Abstracts of Theses. Humanistic Series, II*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. 15s.
- CHROUST, A., *Monumenta palaeographica. Denkmäler der Schreibkunst des Mittelalters (lateinisch und deutsch). III, 1*. Leipzig, O. Harrassowitz. 40 M.
- DELATTRE, F., *Dickens et la France. Étude d'une interaction littéraire anglo-française*. Paris, J. Gamber. 45 fr.
- Jahrbuch für Philologie*. Herausg. von V. Klemperer und E. Lerch. II. Munich, M. Hueber. 12 M.
- LOKOTSCH, K., *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der europäischen Wörter orientalischen Ursprungs (Indogermanische Bibl., iii)*. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 13 M.
- PANKHURST, E. S., *Delphos: The Future of International Language*. London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner. 2s. 6d.
- ROUTH, H. V., *God, Man and Epic Poetry*. 2 vols. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 25s.
- SECHEHAYE, A., *L'école genevoise de linguistique générale (Indogerm. Forschungen, xlv)*.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

Medieval Latin.

- FRANCIS, E. A., *A Hitherto Unprinted Version of the 'Passio Sanctae Margaritae'* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 1).
- WADDELL, H., *The Wandering Scholars*. London, Constable. 21s.

Italian.

- BERTONI, G., *Muratori*. Rome, Formiggini. L. 5.
- BILANCIONI, G., *Il suono e la voce nell' opera di Dante. Rilievi di un otologo*. Pisa, Mariotti e Pacini. L. 200.
- BOCCACCIO, G., *Il Decameron*. A cura di A. F. Massèra. 2 vols. (Scrittori d' Italia.) Bari, Laterza. L. 60.
- BOIARDO, M. M., *Il Canzoniere*. Introd. e note di C. Steiner; *L' Orlando innamorato*. Introd. e note di F. Foffano, II, III. Turin, U. T. E. T. Each, L. 10.
- CAMPANELLA, T., *Lettere*. A cura di V. Spampanato (Scrittori d' Italia). Bari, Laterza. L. 40.
- CELLINI, B., *La Vita scritta per lui medesimo*. Introd. e note di F. Carrara. 2 vols. Turin, U. T. E. T. L. 16.
- CROCE, B., *Poeti e scrittori d' Italia*. I. *Da Dante a V. Cuoco*. II. *Da Alfieri a Pascoli*. Bari, Laterza. L. 16.50 and L. 18.50.
- DAL PRA, A., *L' influenza d' Euripide sul teatro tragico italiano*. Messina, Industrie grafiche. L. 10.

- GENTILE, G., *L' eredità di V. Alfieri*. Venice, *La nuova Italia*. L. 16.
- KRAPPE, A. H., *Une hypothèse sur la source de l' 'Orbecche' di G. B. Giraldis Cinthio (Rev. litt. comp., vii, 2)*.
- MICHELINI, F., *La prosa di Francesco Guicciardini*. Savigliano, Tip. Saviglianese. L. 10.
- ORTOLANI, G., *Voci e visioni del Settecento veneziano*. Bologna, Zanichelli. L. 27.50.
- PALLAVICINO, F., *La retorica*. Catania, Guaitolini. L. 30.
- PALMIERI, E., *Giosuè Carducci*. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 12.
- PASINI, F., *L. Pirandello*. Trieste, *La Vedetta italiana*. L. 30.
- PETRACCONI, E., *La commedia dell' arte*. Storia. Tecnica. Scenari. Naples, Ricciardi. L. 40.
- RIZZO, T., *La poesia sepolcrale in Italia*. Naples, Perrella. L. 40.
- SPOSATO, B., *L' evoluzione poetica di Giosuè Carducci*. Florence, Vallecchi. L. 8.
- STRAPABOLA, G. F., *Le piacevoli notti*. A cura di G. Rua. (Scrittori d' Italia.) Bari, Laterza. L. 40.
- ZOTTOLI, A., *Leopardi (Bibl. di Cultura moderna)*. Bari, Laterza. L. 22.

Spanish.

- BOURLAND, C. B., *The Short Story in Spain in the Seventeenth Century*. Northampton, Mass., Smith College.
- BUCHANAN, M. A., *A Graded Spanish Word Book (Publ. of the American and Canadian Committees on Modern Languages, III)*. Toronto, Univ. of Toronto Press.
- CASTILLEJO, C. DE, *Obras, I. Edición y notas de J. Domínguez Bordona (Clásicos castellanos, lxxii)*. Madrid, La Lectura.
- MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO, M., *Tratado de los romances viejos (Antología de poetas líricos castellanos, xii)*. Madrid, Hernando.
- PAR, A., 'Qui' y 'que' en la Península ibérica, I (*Rev. fil. españ.*, xiii, 4).
- SANTILLANA, MARQUIS OF, *Letter of the, to Don Peter, Constable of Portugal*. Ed. by A. R. Pastor and E. Prestage. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5s.
- SOLALINDE, A. G., *Alfonso X, astrólogo (Rev. fil. españ.*, xiii, 4).
- TARR, F. C., *Literary and Artistic Unity in the 'Lazarillo de Tormes' (Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 2).
- VALDÉS, J. DE, *Dialogo de las linguas*. Ed. by J. H. Perry. London, Univ. of London Press. 5s.
- VEGA, LOPE DE, *Colección escógida de obras no dramáticas*. Madrid, Hernando.

French.

(a) General (incl. Linguistic).

- BRUNOT, F., *Histoire de la langue française*. ix, 1. Paris, A. Colin. 75 fr.
- GAMILLSCHEG, E., *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der französischen Sprache*. Lief. ix, x. Heidelberg, C. Winter. Each 2 M.
- HUGUET, E., *Dictionnaire de la langue française du seizième siècle*. I, 4, 5. Paris, H. Champion.
- Mélanges de philologie et d'histoire offerts à M. Antoine Thomas par ses élèves et ses amis*. Paris, H. Champion. 100 fr.
- PIQUET, F., *Le patois de Dombras (Meuse) (Rev. phil. franç.*, xxxviii, 2).
- SNEYDERS DE VOGEL, K., *Syntaxe historique du français*. 2me éd. Groningen, J. B. Wolters. 7 fl. 90.
- WEERENBECK, B. H. J., *Participe présent et gérondif*. Nijmegen, Dekker en van de Vegt. (Amsterdam Dissertation.)

(b) *Old French (Anglo-Norman).*

- BÉDIER, J., *La Chanson de Roland. Commentaires et glossaire.* Paris, H. Piazza. 40 fr.
- GODDARD, E. R., *Women's Costume in French Texts of the Eleventh and Twelfth centuries* (Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Lit. and Lang., vii). Paris, Les Presses Universitaires. 32 fr.
- LEVY, R., *The Astrological Works of Abraham Ibn Ezra. A Literary and Linguistic Study with special reference to the Old French Translation of Hagin.* (Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Lit. and Lang., viii.) Paris, Les Presses Universitaires. \$1.50.
- Prophecies de Merlin, Les.* Ed. by L. A. Paton. 2 vols. (Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America. Monograph Series.) New York, D. C. Heath; London, H. Milford.
- REINHARD, J. R., *The Old French Romance of Amadas et Ydoine. An Historical Study.* Durham, North Carolina, Duke Univ. Press. \$3.50.
- Winchester, *The Ancient Usage of the City of. From the Anglo-French Version in Winchester College.* Ed. by J. S. Finsley. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d.

(c) *Modern French.*

- AITKIN, E. G., *The Supernaturalism of Maupassant* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 1).
- AMIEL, H. F., *Philine. Fragments inédits du Journal intime.* Publiés par B. Bouvier. Paris, Éditions de la Pléiade.
- ARRIGON, L. J., *Les années romantiques de Balzac.* Paris, Perrin. 12 fr.
- ASCOLI, G., *La Grande-Bretagne devant l'opinion française depuis la guerre de cent ans jusqu'à la fin du xvii^e siècle.* Paris, J. Gamber. 50 fr.
- AUBIGNAC, L'Abbé d', *La pratique du théâtre.* Nouvelle édition par P. Martino. Paris, H. Champion.
- BADOLLE, M., *L'Abbé J. J. Barthélemy (1716-95) et l'Hellénisme en France dans la seconde moitié du xviii^e siècle.* Paris, Les Presses Universitaires. 40 fr.
- BALDENSPERGER, F., *Orientations étrangères chez H. de Balzac* (*Bibl. de la Rev. de litt. comparée*, xxxi). Paris, H. Champion. 40 fr.
- BERTRAND, L. (ALOYSIUS), *Oeuvres poétiques.* Publiées par C. Sprietsma. Paris, H. Champion.
- BOYD, E., *Guy de Maupassant. A Biographical Study.* London, A. Knopf. 21s.
- BRAY, R., *La Formation de la doctrine classique en France.* Paris, Hachette.
- BRAY, R., *La Tragédie cornélienne devant la critique classique.* Paris, Hachette.
- CERF, B., *Anatole France. The Degeneration of a Great Artist.* London, A. Melrose. 18s.
- CHARLIER, G., *Le mouvement romantique en Belgique* (*Acad. royale de lang. et de litt. françaises, Bulletin*, v, 5).
- CLEMENT, N. H., *The Eclecticism of Rabelais* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 2).
- CLOUZOT, H., et R. H. VALENSI, *Le Paris de la Comédie humaine.* Paris, Le Goupy. 80 fr.
- DEFFOUX, L., *J. K. Huysmans sous divers aspects.* Paris, Crès. 60 fr.
- DIMIER, L., *La vie raisonnable de Descartes.* Paris, Plon. 15 fr.
- DROUGARD, E., *L'intersigne de Villiers de l'Isle-Adam* (*Rev. d'Hist. litt.*, xxxiv, 1).
- ÉTIENNE, S., *La méthode en histoire littéraire à propos d'une publication récente* (*Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, v, 4).
- FAGUET, É., *Histoire de la poésie française de la Renaissance au Romantisme*, III. Paris, Boivin. 15 fr.

- FLUTRE, F., Éclaircissements sur les 'Feuilles d'automne' (*Rev. d'Hist. litt.*, xxxiv, 1).
- French Poets of the Twentieth Century, The. An Anthology chosen by L. E. Kastner. London, E. Dent. 7s. 6d.
- GIESE, W. F., Victor Hugo: The Man and the Poet. London, A. Melrose. 18s.
- GROS, E., Philippe Quinault, sa vie et ses œuvres. Paris, H. Champion. 75 fr.
- HALLAYS, A., Les Perrault. Paris, Perrin. 20 fr.
- JACQUEMIN, J., Lamartine, ses origines franc-comtoises. Paris, J. Audin. 25 fr.
- KNOFF, A., Jules Lemaître als Dramatiker. Leipzig, R. Pries. 3 M.
- LANSON, G., Esquisse d'une histoire de la tragédie française. Nouvelle éd. Paris, H. Champion.
- LAWTON, H. W., Tércence en France au xvii^e siècle. Paris, Jouve. 8s. 6d.
- MAYNIAL, É., Flaubert et son milieu. Paris, Nouv. rev. critique. 12 fr.
- MÉRIMÉE, P., Oeuvres complètes. I, II. Paris, H. Champion. 60 fr.
- MONGRÉDIEN, G., Les poésies de Molière et celles qui lui ont été attribuées (*Rev. d'Hist. litt.*, xxxiv, 1).
- PALMAROCCHI, R., Letteratura francese contemporanea. Rome, La Voce. L. 15.
- PORCHÉ, F., La vie douloureuse de Charles Baudelaire. Paris, Plon. 15 fr.
- PRÉVOST, A. F., Mémoires et aventures d'un homme de qualité, tome v. Édition critique par M. E. I. Robertson. (Bibl. de la Revue de litt. comparée, xxxviii.) Paris, H. Champion. 30 fr.
- QUINAULT, PH., La mère coquette. Éd. critique par E. Gros. Paris, H. Champion.
- RAYMOND, M., Bibliographie critique de Ronsard en France. Paris, H. Champion. 25 fr.
- RAYMOND, M., L'influence de Ronsard sur la pensée française (1550-85). 2 vols. (Bibl. Littéraire de la Renaissance, xiv, xv.) Paris, H. Champion. 75 fr.
- RIMESTAD, C., Baudelaire. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 8 kr. 50.
- ROBERTSON, M. E. I., L'épithète dans les œuvres lyriques de Victor Hugo publiées avant l'exil. Paris, H. Champion. 50 fr.
- SCHOELL, F. L., Étude sur le roman paysan naturaliste de Zola à Reymont (*Rev. litt. comp.*, vii, 2).
- SEILLÈRE, E., Pour le centenaire du romantisme. Un examen de conscience. Paris, H. Champion.
- SEVERIN, F., Alfred de Vigny (*Acad. royale de lang. et litt. franç.*, Bulletin, v, 5).
- SPAAR, P., Jean Lemaire de Belges: sa vie, son œuvre, ses meilleures pages. Paris, H. Champion. 25 fr.
- SPRIETSMAN, C., Louis Bertrand, dit Aloysius Bertrand, 1807-41. Paris, H. Champion.
- WEST, E. S., The Apology of Arthur Rimbaud. A Dialogue. London, Hogarth Press. 2s. 6d.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

- HEUSLER, A., Deutsche Versgeschichte, II, 3 (Grundriss der german. Phil., viii, 2). Berlin, W. de Gruyter. 16 M.

Scandinavian.

- Grønlandske Ordbog, Den. Grønl.-Dansk. Ny Udgave. Udg. af Kirkeministeriet med Tilskud fra Grønlands Fællesfond ved Schultz-Lorenzen. Copenhagen, Gad. 70 kr.

HAUBERG, P., En middelalderlig dansk Lægebog. Udg. af. Copenhagen, Koppel. 3 kr.

HOLLANDER, L. M., Were the Mythological Poems of the Edda composed in the Pre-Christian Era? (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxvi, 1).

JACOBSEN, L., Dansk Sprog. Kritik og Studier. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 12 kr.

JÓNSSON, F., Óláfr Þórðarson. Máhljóða- og Málskrúðsrit. Grammatisk-retorisk Afhandling. (Dansk Videnskabernes Selskab. Hist.-fil. Meddelelser, xiii, 2.) Copenhagen, Høst. 6 kr.

JOSEPHSON, R., Romantiken. Stockholm, Bonnier. 12 kr. 50.

KIERKEGAARD, S., Opbyggelige Taler. Udvalg ved N. C. Nielsen. Copenhagen, Martin. 4 kr.

LUNDBERG, G. W., Bellmansfigurer. Kulturhistoriska tidsbilder och person-historiska anteckningar till Fredmansdikten. Stockholm, Geber. 11 kr. 50.

NIELSEN, H. G., Danske Folkeviser. Historiske Viser. Copenhagen, Martin. 4 kr.

PALLADIUS, P., Danske Skrifter. Udg. af L. Jacobsen. 5 Bind. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 25 kr.

PALUDAN-MÜLLER, F., Adam Homo. Udg. af O. Schlichtkrull. Copenhagen, Martin. 4 kr.

PETERSEN, C. S., og V. ANDERSEN, Illustr. Dansk Litteraturhistorie. 17.-19. Hæfte. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. Each 1 kr. 50.

RØNNING, F., B. S. Ingemann. Liv og Digtning. Copenhagen, Gad. 4 kr. 50.

Völuspa. Vølvens Spaadom. Udg. of tolket af S. Nørdal. Copenhagen, H. Aschehoug. 6 kr. 50.

Dutch, Flemish, Low German.

ALCKMER, HINREK VAN, The Cambridge Reinaert Fragments. Ed. by K. Breul. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.

JACOBS, J., Het Westvlaamsch van de oudste tijden tot heden. Groningen, J. B. Wolters. 6 fl. 50.

LECOUTERE, C. P. F., Inleiding tot de taalkunde en tot de geschiedenis van het nederlandsch. 3. Druk. Groningen, J. B. Wolters. 4 fl. 90.

MULTATULLI, Max Havelaar. Transl. by W. Siebenhaar. London, A. Knopf. 10s. 6d.

SARAUW, C., Nedertysk. En Indledning til Sprogets Historie. (Studier fra Sprog- og Oldtidsforskning, cxlii.) Copenhagen, V. Pio. 1 kr. 50.

STERCK, J. F. M., Het leven van Joost van den Vondel. Haarlem, F. Bohn. 1 fl. 90.

English.

(a) General (incl. Linguistic).

AIKIN, W. A., English Vowel Sounds; H. W. FOWLER, 'Ing' (S. P. E. Tracts, xxvi). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2s. 6d.

CALLAWAY, M., Concerning the Number of Cases in Modern English (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 1).

COLLINSON, W. E., Contemporary English. A Personal Speech Record. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 4 M. 80.

CRAIGIE, W. A., The Study of American English (S. P. E. Tracts, xxvi). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2s. 6d.

FRIES, C. C., The Rules of Common School Grammars (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 1).

GRAVES, R., Lars Porsena: or the Future of Swearing and Improper Language. London, Kegan Paul. 2s. 6d.

KARSTEN, G., *Agð. nāmon-zeāfon* (*Engl. Studien*, lxi, 1).

KENNEDY, A. G., *A Bibliography of Writings on the English Language from the Beginning of Printing to the end of 1922*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 105s.

Probleme der englischen Sprache und Kultur. Festschrift für Joh. Hoops. Herausg. von W. Keller. Heidelberg, C. Winter.

Studies in English. No. 6. University of Texas Bulletin, No. 2648. December, 1926.

WATSON, W. J., *The History of the Celtic Place-Names of Scotland*. Edinburgh, W. Blackwood. 30s.

WILSON, Sir JAMES, *The Dialects of Central Scotland*. London, H. Milford. 7s. 6d.
Year's Work in English Studies, The. vi (1925). Ed. by F. S. Boas and C. H. Herford for the English Association. London, H. Milford. 7s. 6d.

ZACHRISSON, R. E., *English Place-Names and River-Names containing the Primitive Germanic Roots *vis, *vask* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1926). Uppsala, A. B. Lundequist. 2 kr. 25.

(b) *Old and Middle English*.

AUDIAN, J., *Les Troubadours et l'Angleterre*. Paris, J. Vrin.

COWLING, G. H., *Chaucer*. London, Methuen. 6s.

CUTTIS, J. T., *The Horoscope in Chaucer's 'Man of Law's Tale'* (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxvi, 1).

Floris and Blancheflour. A Middle-English Romance. Ed. by A. B. Taylor. London, H. Milford. 4s. 6d.

KLAEBER, F., *Attila's and Beowulf's Funeral* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 2).

LAWRENCE, W. W., *Medieval Story and the Beginnings of the Social Ideals of the English-speaking People*. New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 12s. 6d.

MALONE, K., *Hrethric* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 2).

SERJEANTSON, M. S., *The Dialects of the West Midlands in Middle English* (*Rev. Engl. Studies*, iii, 9, 10).

STEWART, G. R., *The Meter of 'Piers Plowman'* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 1).

WELLS, J. E., *Third Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1400*. New Haven, Conn., Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 6s. 6d.

WESSÉN, E., *De nordiska folkstammarna i Beowulf* (*Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar*, xxxvi, 2). Stockholm, Wahlström och Widstrand. 3 kr.

WILLARD, R., *Vercelli Homily VIII and the 'Christ'* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 2).

(c) *Modern English*.

ALBRIGHT, E. M., *Dramatic Publication in England, 1580-1640* (*Mod. Lang. Association of America. Monograph Series*, ii). New York, D. C. Heath; London, H. Milford. 21s.

BALDWIN, T. W., *Posting Henslowe's Accounts* (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxvi, 1).

BATHO, E. C., *The Ettrick Shepherd. A Critical Study of the Life and Writings of James Hogg*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.

BRATTY, J. M., *Churchill's Influence on Minor Eighteenth-Century Satirists* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 1).

BLUNDEN, E., *On the Poems of Henry Vaughan*. London, Cobden Sanderson. 5s.

- BRETTLE, R. E., *S. Daniel and the Children of the Queen's Revels, 1604-5* (*Rev. Engl. Stud.*, iii, 10).
- BROWN, S. J., *The World of Imagery*. London, Kegan Paul. 12s. 6d.
- BURNS, R., *Poems, chiefly in the Scottish Dialect* (Facsimile of the Kilmarnock ed. of 1786). London, Werner Laurie. 7s. 6d.
- BUSH, D., *The Influence of Marlowe's 'Hero and Leander' on Early Mythological Poems* (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xlii, 4).
- BYROM, H. J., *Tottel's Miscellany, 1717-1817* (*Rev. Engl. Stud.*, iii, 9).
- CASE, A. E., *Notes on the Bibliography of Pope (1679-1741)* (*Mod. Phil.*, xxiv, 3).
- CASSON, T. E., *Wordsworth and the 'Spectator'* (*Rev. Engl. Stud.*, iii, 10).
- CHESTERFIELD, EARL OF, *Poetical Works*. London, Elkin Mathews. 25s.
- CHILD, H., *Revivals of English Dramatic Works, 1901-18* (*Rev. Engl. Stud.*, iii, 10).
- COLLINS, A. S., *Authorship in the Days of Johnson, 1726-80*. London, Holden. 30s.
- CONLEY, C. H., *The First English Translations of the Classics*. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 13s. 6d.
- CRAIGIE, W. A., *Macpherson on Pinkerton: Literary Amenities of the 18th century* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 2).
- CRANE, R. S., and F. B. KAYE, *A Census of British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1620-1800* (*Studies in Philology*, xxiv, 1).
- DANIEL, G., *Recollections of Charles Lamb*. London, Elkin Mathews. 6s.
- DARBISHIRE, H., *Keats and Egypt* (*Rev. Engl. Stud.*, iii, 9).
- DEXTER, W., *Some Rogues and Vagabonds of Dickens*. London, C. Palmer. 15s.
- DICKENS, C., *Unpublished Letters to Mark Lemon*. Ed. by W. Dexter. London, Halton and Smith. 42s.
- DISRAELI, B., *EARL OF BEACONSFIELD, Novels and Tales*. Bradenham Edition. i-v. London, P. Davies. Each 10s. 6d.
- DOBELL, P. J., *Catalogue of an Important Collection of Poetical Manuscripts of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. London, Dobell. 1s.
- ELLIS-FERMOR, U. M., *Christopher Marlowe*. London, Methuen. 6s.
- ERNLE, LORD, *The Light Reading of our Ancestors*. London, Hutchinson. 15s.
- FOSTER, J. R., *The Abbé Prévost and the English Novel* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 2).
- FREEMAN, E. L., *Bacon's Influence on John Hall* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 2).
- FRIPP, E. I., *Katharine Hamlet and 'Ophelia'* (*Times Lit. Suppl.*, Mar. 17).
- GARROD, H. W., *Wordsworth*. 2nd ed. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d.
- GIBSON, A., *New Light on Allan Ramsay*. Edinburgh, W. Brown. 5s.
- HANFORD, J. H., *A Milton Handbook*. London, G. Bell. 6s.
- HAZLITT, W., *New Writings by*. Second Series. Ed. by P. P. Howe. London, M. Secker. 7s. 6d.
- JENKINS, R., *Drayton's 'Sirena Again'* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 1).
- JUDSON, A. C., *Henry Vaughan as a Nature Poet* (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 1).
- MACLEAN, C. M., *Dorothy and William Wordsworth*. Cambridge Univ. Press. 6s.
- MAKKINK, H. J., *Ph. Massinger and John Fletcher. A Comparison*. Rotterdam, Nijgh en van Ditmar. 4 fl. 90.
- McKERROW, R. B., *The Capital Letters in Elizabethan Handwriting* (*Rev. Engl. Stud.*, iii, 9).

- MÉGROZ, R. L., Francis Thompson, the Poet of Earth and Heaven. London, Faber and Gwyer. 12s. 6d.
- MILNER, G., On Some Marginalia made by D. G. Rossetti in a Copy of Keats's Poems (*Engl. Studien*, lxi, 2).
- MYERS, W. L., The Later Realism. A Study of Characterisation in the British Novel. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 10s.
- OTWAY, T., Complete Works. Ed. by M. Summers. 5 vols. London, Nonesuch Press. 42s.
- Pack of Autolycus, The. Ed. by H. E. Rollins. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. \$5.
- POE, E. A., Works. 2 vols. London, H. Milford. Each 3s. 6d.
- POTTER, G. R., James Thomson and the Evolution of Spirits (*Engl. Studien*, lxi, 1).
- ROBERTSON, J. M., The Problems of the Shakespeare Sonnets. London, G. Routledge. 25s.
- ROBINSON, C., and others, A Handfull of Pleasant Delites. Ed. by A. Kershaw. London, W. Laurie. 7s. 6d.
- SEEGER, O., Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Antike und Moderne in England bis zum Tode S. Johnsons. Leipzig, Mayer und Müller. 5 M.
- Selections from English Dramatists. Ed. by G. R. Crump. London, G. G. Harrap. 3s. 6d.
- SHAKESPEARE, W., The Tragedy of Richard III. Ed. by J. R. Crawford. (Yale Shakespeare.) New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 4s. 6d.
- Shakespeare-Jahrbuch. Herausg. von W. Keller. LXII. Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 8 M.
- SHANKS, E., Second Essays on Literature. London, W. Collins. 16s.
- SHERIDAN, R. B., An Ode to Scandal together with a Portrait. Ed. by R. C. Rhodes. Oxford, B. Blackwell. 4s. 6d.
- SHINE, R., The Influence of Keats upon Rossetti (*Engl. Studien*, lxi, 2).
- SIMPSON, E. M., Two MSS. of Donne's 'Paradoxes and Problems' (*Rev. Engl. Studies*, iii, 10).
- SMALL, S. A., Shakesperean Character Interpretation: The Merchant of Venice (*Hesperia*, Erg.-Reihe, x). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 5 M.
- SPARROW, J., The Text of Cowley's 'Mistress' (*Rev. Engl. Studies*, iii, 9).
- STARNES, D. T., Notes on Elyot's 'The Governour' (*Rev. Engl. Studies*, iii, 9).
- STEELE, M. S., Plays and Masques at Court during the Reigns of Elizabeth, James and Charles. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 18s.
- STERNE, L., Works. Shakespeare Head Edition. 3 vols. Oxford, B. Blackwell. Each 7s. 6d.
- STEVENSON, L., Appraisals of Canadian Literature. London, Macmillan. 8s. 6d.
- THOMAS, W., Le poète Edward Young, 1683-1765. Paris, J. Gamber. 50 fr.
- THRALE, Mrs. The Letters of. Selected by R. B. Johnson. London, J. Lane. 6s.
- TILLEY, M. P., The Comedy 'Lingua' and the 'Faerie Queene' (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xlii, 3).
- TOLMAN, A. H., 'Mary Hamilton': the Group Authorship of Ballads (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 2).
- TOMPKINS, J. M. S., James White, Esq. (*Rev. Engl. Studies*, iii, 10).
- TUKE, Sir SAMUEL, The Adventures of Five Hours. Ed. by A. E. H. Swaen. Amsterdam, Swets en Zeitlinger.

- TURNER, A. M., Rossetti's Reading and his Critical Opinions (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 2).
- Types of Poetry, exclusive of the Drama. Ed. by H. J. Hall. Boston, Ginn. \$3.
- UNTERMAYER, L., The Forms of Poetry. A Pocket Dictionary of Verse. 2nd ed. London, J. Cape. 5s.
- WALLERSTEIN, R. C., Personal Experience in Rossetti's 'House of Life' (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xlii, 2).
- WHITE, H. C., The Mysticism of William Blake (Univ. of Wisconsin Studies in Lang. and Literature). Madison, Wis., Univ. of Wisconsin. \$2.50.
- WHITE, H. O., The Letters of William Collins (*Rev. Engl. Studies*, iii, 9).
- WILSON, D. A., Carlyle at his Zenith, 1848-53. London, Kegan Paul. 15s.
- WRIGHT, L. B., Juggling Tricks and Conjuring on the English Stage before 1642 (*Mod. Phil.*, xxiv, 3).
- WRIGHT, T. H., Francis Thompson and his Poetry. London, G. G. Harrap. 2s.

German.

(a) General (incl. Linguistic).

- GERHARD, M., Der deutsche Entwicklungsroman bis zu Goethes 'Wilhelm Meister' (Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift, Buchreihe, ix). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 7 M. 50.
- GRIMM, J. und W., Briefwechsel mit K. Lachmann. Herausg. von A. Leitzmann. Lief. vii. Jena, Frommann. 5 M. 25.
- GROOS, H., Der deutsche Idealismus und das Christentum. Munich, E. Reinhardt. 15 M.
- MENSING, O., Schleswig-holsteinisches Wörterbuch. Volksausgabe. Lief. x. Neumünster, K. Wachholtz. 2 M.
- MERKER, P., und W. STAMMLER, Reallexikon der deutschen Literatur. II, 5. Berlin, W. de Gruyter. 3 M. 50.
- MÜLLER, J., Rheinisches Wörterbuch. I, 12. Bonn, F. Klopp. 2 M. 50.
- REHM, W., Geschichte des deutschen Romans. 2 vols. (Sammlung Göschen, 229, 956.) Berlin, W. de Gruyter. Each 1 M. 50.
- SOHOPE, G., Beiträge zur deutschen Wortgeschichte (*Neuphil. Mitteil.*, xxviii, 1, 2).
- SCHWARZ, E., Die Ortsnamen des östlichen Oberösterreich (Prager deutsche Studien, xlii). Reichenberg, F. Kraus. 5 M.
- ULLMANN, R., und H. GOTTHARD, Geschichte des Begriffes 'Romantisch' in Deutschland (Germanische Studien, I). Berlin, E. Ebering. 15 M.
- WREDE, F., Deutscher Sprachatlas in vereinfachter Form. Lief. i. Marburg, N. G. Elwert. 7 M. 50.

(b) Old and Middle High German.

- BERTHOLD, L., Alter Text und moderne Mundart. Grundsätzliches zur Heimatbestimmung alter Texte. (Rheinische Beitr. und Hilfsbücher zur germ. Phil., xiii.) Bonn, F. Klopp. 4 M.
- EHRISMANN, G., Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. II, 2. Munich, C. H. Beck. 13 M. 50.
- KROGMANN, W., Die Anfangsstrophen des Ezzoliedes (*Neuphil. Mitteil.*, xxviii, 1, 2).
- MISCH, G., Wolframs Parzival. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Autobiographie. (*Deut. Vierteljahrsschr.*, v, 2.)
- RICHEY, M. F., Schionatulander and Sigune. Interpreted and discussed. London, A. Moring. 5s.

- ROSENFELD, H. F., *Mittelhochdeutsche Novellenstudien* (Palaestra, cliii). Leipzig, Mayer und Müller. 34 M.
- SCHROßL, A., *Der Urdichter des Liedes von der Nibelunge Nôt und die Lösung der Nibelungenfrage*. Munich, J. B. Hohenester. 13 M.
- STROPPEL, R., *Liturgie und geistliche Dichtung zwischen 1050 und 1300* (Deutsche Forschungen, xvii). Frankfurt, M. Diesterweg. 9 M.
- WERNHER, PRIESTER, Maria. *Bruchstücke und Umarbeitungen*. Herausg. von C. Wesle. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 20 M.
- WIRNT VON GRAVENBERG, Wigalois. Herausg. von J. M. N. Kapteyn. 1. (Rheinische Beitr. und Hilfsbücher zur german. Phil., ix.) Bonn, F. Klopp. 25 M.

(c) *Modern German.*

- BAMBERG, E. VON, *Drei Schauspieler der Goethezeit* (Leo, Unzelmann, Schöninger-Marconi) (Theatergeschichtliche Forschungen, xxxvi). Leipzig, L. Voss. 3 M. 60.
- BEREND, E., *Prolegomena zur historisch-kritischen Gesamtausgabe von Jean Pauls Werken*. Berlin, Akad. der Wissenschaften (W. de Gruyter). 5 M.
- BIEDERMANN, F. VON, J. F. Unger im Verkehr mit Goethe und Schiller. Briefe und Nachrichten. Berlin, H. Berthold. 20 M.
- BREWER, E. V., *Lessing and the Corrective Value of Comedy* (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxvi, 1).
- BRINKMANN, H., *Die Idee des Lebens in der deutschen Romantik*. Augsburg, B. Filser. 2 M. 80.
- CLEMEN, O., *Valentin Ickelsamer* (*Mod. Phil.*, xxiv, 3).
- DEUSCHLE, M. J., *Die Verarbeitung biblischer Stoffe im deutschen Roman des Barock*. Amsterdam, H. J. Paris. 3 fl. 75.
- EICHENDORFF, K. VON, *Ein Jahrhundert Eichendorff-Literatur* (Sämtliche Werke, xxii). Regensburg, J. Habel. 2 M.
- ELLINGER, G., *Angelus Silesius. Ein Lebensbild*. Breslau, W. G. Korn. 7 M.
- FARINELLI, A., *Poesia germanica*. Milan, Corbaccio. L. 22.
- FEIST, R., *Rachel Varnhagen. Zwischen Romantik und jungem Deutschland*. Elberfeld, Hofbauer. 2 M.
- GOETHE, J. W. VON, *Werke. Festausgabe*. Herausg. von R. Petsch. xiv-xviii. Leipzig, Bibl. Institut. Each 4 M. 25.
- GRILLPARZER, F., *Sämtliche Werke*, I, vi. Libussa. Ein Bruderzwist in Habsburg. Vienna, A. Schroll. 12 M.
- HAHN, P., G. C. Lichtenberg und die exakten Wissenschaften. Materialien zu seiner Biographie. (Vorarbeiten zur Geschichte der Göttinger Universität, iv.) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 4 M.
- HERDER, J. F., *Briefwechsel mit Caroline Flachsland*. Herausg. von H. Schauer. 1. (Schriften der Goethe-Gesellschaft, xxxix.) Weimar, Goethe-Gesellschaft.
- IBERSHOFF, C. H., *Bodmer and Klopstock once more* (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxvi, 1).
- INGERSLEV, F., *Genie und sinnverwandte Ausdrücke in den Schriften und Briefen F. Schlegels*. Berlin, Askanischer Verlag. 15 M.
- Jahrbuch der Kleist-Gesellschaft*. 1927. (Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft, vii, viii.) Berlin, Weidmann. 12 M.
- JENSEN, H., *Schiller zwischen Goethe und Kant* (Det Norske Videnskaps-Akad., ii. Hist.-filos. Klasse, i). Oslo, J. Dybwad. 6 kr.
- LAPORTE, L., *Lohensteins 'Arminius'*. Ein Dokument des deutschen Literaturbarock. (German. Stud., xlviii.) Berlin, E. Ebering. 4 M. 20.

- MAACKENSEN, L., Die deutschen Volksbücher (Forschungen zur deut. Geistesgeschichte, ii). Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 8 M.
- NAGL, J. W., und J. ZEIDLER, Deutsch-österreichische Literaturgeschichte. III, 2. Herausgegeben von E. Castle. Vienna, C. Fromme. 8 M. 40.
- RABEL, G., Goethe und Kant. 2 Bände. Vienna, G. Rabel. 12 M. 50.
- RAMECKERS, J. M., Der Kindesmord in der Literatur der Sturm- und Drang-Periode (Proefschrift, Univ. Amsterdam). Rotterdam, Nijgh en van Ditmar. 5 fl. 90.
- RAS, G., Börne und Heine als politische Schriftsteller. Groningen, J. B. Wolters. 3 fl. 90.
- SCHNEIDER, F. J., Der expressive Mensch und die deutsche Lyrik der Gegenwart. Stuttgart, J. B. Metzler. 7 M.
- SCHUCHARD, G. C. L., Studien zur Verskunst des jungen Klopstock (Tübinger Germanist. Arbeiten, ii). Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer. 4 M. 50.
- SEIBERTH, PH., Das Element des Romantischen in Goethe (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxvi, 1).
- SIEBER, D., Stifters Nachsommer (Jenaer germanist. Forschungen, x). Jena, Frommann. 4 M. 80.
- WASER, M., J. V. Widmann (Die Schweiz im deut. Geistesleben, xlvi, xlvii). Frauenfeld, Huber. 4 fr.
- WITTNER, O., Deutsche Literaturgeschichte vom westfälischen Frieden bis zum Ausbruch des Weltkriegs. 2 Bände. Dresden, Kaden. 12 M.

CHAUCER AND LADY FORTUNE

ALTHOUGH Christianity was the faith of Europe in the Middle Ages, man had to face the problem of chance in that period as apparently in any other. It is all very well to have an official creed or a theoretical idealism, but practical necessity requires that one's principles shall be rigorously tested by personal application. Is the universe sufficiently well ordered for us to proceed on a belief that its laws are deeply fixed and ineluctable; or shall we fear that law is but another name for 'blind force'? Are the shipwreck and the earthquake only the expression of nature's caprice, or may we trust that not even a sparrow falls without Divine purpose? There is so much of the seemingly casual in ordinary life that some decision in the matter cannot be avoided if one is going to rely on any course of action whatsoever, even if it be nothing more than to 'take a chance.' The solution arrived at is, accordingly, an indication of a certain view of life; and it reveals, in some measure, the character of the person who arrives at it. The true rationalist must believe that reason has some inherent validity in life, however inconsistently maintained; and the temperament that cares less for system and order will find freedom in a universe in which the only plan seems to be that of adventure. As we think, so are we; and reflections of what men are may be found shining in the royal progress of the Goddess of Fortune through mediæval literary history.

When Fortuna was taken over from Roman culture at the beginning of the period, she outlived the other pagan deities partly because she had been by far the most popular during the late Roman Empire, and partly because, unlike most of the rest, she was not a deity of a special function, but had almost taken unto herself the eminence of the supreme conception of monotheism. In faith she was the only alternative to a belief in a rational God. Moreover she was a convenient figure to blame when, dissatisfied with one's portion in life, one felt that circumstances so little pleasing to man could hardly be more pleasing to a competently rational Deity. Down through the Middle Ages she persisted, with her pagan dress and also with borrowed robes. Various and richly detailed are the descriptions afforded by different writers, who see her in their interesting and vivid ways. One of two solutions is adopted by most of them for the problem which she represents: some authors candidly accept her, or at least find in her a useful symbol; others, like

the Church Fathers and many of the philosophers, reject her utterly¹. Some others still, with the desire perhaps to remain orthodox, or with indifference to consistency, seem to have tried to keep Fortune with the Christian God without reconciling the two. In this apparently impossible task, however, with true orthodoxy and philosophical consistency, the poet Dante succeeded in paying due tribute to chance and in keeping a rational God, and so gives us a third way of dealing with the question². In a well-known passage in the seventh canto of the *Inferno* (ll. 70-96) Virgil describes to Dante the nature of Fortune, as a creature subordinate to the Christian God, a ministering angel who carries out the Divine bidding. For everything that she does she has reasons of her own; but she keeps her counsel and endures the abuse mortals fling at her:

Con l' altre prime creature lieta
Volve sua spera, e beata si gode.

(ll. 95-96.)

This serene figure Boccaccio and others tried to copy, but usually without much success, and, so far as I can discover, she is not to be passed along as a literary heritage.

These three points of view regarding chance were, then, familiar in the Middle Ages. Writers classify themselves almost automatically by the one they show: the romantic mind was content to leave things to chance, with or without personification; the rationalist, falling in with a tradition from Aristotle to St Thomas Aquinas, usually ended by denying Fortune's existence; and some others, perhaps taking quality from both the romanticist and the rationalist, held to a belief in chance subordinate to reason, a kind of personification of Aristotle's *causa per accidens*. In this third conception the poet simply outruns the hard-headed philosopher, who, in turn, pointing to the implicit contradiction in the idea, would probably insist that poets go too far. Yet the poet would have the advantage in replying that even the philosopher must admit the existence of apparent chance, and that the Christian conception of the angelic Fortuna really does no more than take full account of that. Classifying writers according to their views on this subject as on others must, however, always be a precarious business; for not every author is intent on expressing himself fully about chance or any other matter. But while we may be on our guard against judging individuals in that way, we may derive some profit from classifying opinions which

¹ A more detailed survey of the tradition will be found in my articles in the *Smith College Studies in Modern Languages*, III, 3-4, pp. 131 ff. and IV, 4, pp. 1 ff.

² Boethius closely approximated his solution, but his suggestion is applied to Fate rather than Fortune. See the article cited above in *Smith College Studies*, III, 4, pp. 190 ff.

have actually been held by men, and by such means it is possible that we may learn something as well about the men themselves

In fourteenth-century England the problem of chance was emphatically brought to the attention of thoughtful writers. The part Fortune had played in literature, at a time when source-hunting was an occupation even of authors, insured some degree of notice. Furthermore, political conditions were sufficiently restless during the Hundred Years' War with France, the events of the reign of Richard II, and also those social upheavals which marked the beginning of a new era, to suggest that circumstances really turn on the wheel of the fickle goddess. In the air was the fragrance of the new wine that stirred men's blood and that later brought them into a period very similar to that of the sceptical and adventurous Augustan Rome. The moral Gower deals with Fortune as we should expect, denying her existence, and calling on men to be masters of their souls; Lydgate takes over material from Boccaccio and other sources, inclining rather definitely to the Christian conception. References to the great problem appear all through the work of Chaucer; and he is both casual and systematic in his consideration of what is involved.

In what we may be reasonably sure was his earliest extensive and original work, the *Book of the Duchesse*, a long treatment of Fortune is introduced. At first sight this is a conventional poem of the Court of Love; but, as critics have observed, it is a Court of Love vision used as an elegy¹. If the Middle English *Pearl* shows a similar transformation of material, at least there the rue is worn with a difference; for there we find nothing of the humour which Chaucer has used in order to convey his caressing sympathy with more warmth. Moreover, in borrowing one convention after another, he has been able to keep something of the original implication of the literary forms: like everything addressed to such a lady as Blanche her elegy must be a love poem; the dream is really a dream, for the great John of Gaunt would not pour out his woes to Geoffrey Chaucer; the birds and their solemn service add a sweet note of portent; the long description of the lady is done in the best Court of Love manner, with every item told (although perhaps even then Chaucer knew better methods of description); and lastly false Fortune herself must be mentioned. In similar French poetry she had almost usurped the place of the God of Love². Ordinarily one would have supposed that such an addition would be out of key in an

¹ See G. L. Kittredge, *Chaucer and his Poetry*, Cambridge, Mass., 1915, pp. 54 ff.

² See *Smith College Studies*, iv, 4, pp. 15 ff. for instances.

elegy; but not so. Along with the rest of the apparatus so often employed to tell a desperate passion, where only a fickle deity holds sway, she now keeps her place in a poem where the passion is desperate indeed, and where her former meaning is made even more significant by the same alchemy which produced the other changes. The point is this: the sufferings of these present times, in the loss of the Duchess, are not to be ascribed to a rational God; they come from a whimsical deity, who is unconcerned with justice and mercy. And if John of Gaunt had read Chaucer's main source, Machaut's poem on the *Jugement dou Roy de Behaingne*¹, he would have felt the added consolation of reflecting that loss by death is better than loss by infidelity².

The usual formulæ associated with the tradition occur in the *Book of the Duchesse*, and similar apparatus appears again in the *House of Fame*, transferred, however, to Fame herself³. These instances show how well Chaucer knew the material. I shall pass on to a piece of work which he did probably some time between 1378 and 1381, if our guesses are correct. This was his translation of the *Consolation of Philosophy* of Boethius, which, partly through the borrowings in the *Roman de la Rose*, and partly through direct influence, so deeply affected his own thought. Here he found a wealth of detail regarding the pagan Fortune, especially in the second book, much of which he uses later, and he also found certain implications which lead naturally to the Christian figure. One can see the development of this idea in his translation, in lines which closely follow the Latin:

For-ty wenestow that this mutaciouns of fortune fleten with-out governour.... I have grete norisshings of thyn hele, and that is, the sothe sentence of governaunce of the worlde; that thou bilevest that the governinge of it nis nat subiect ne underput to the folie of thise happes aventurous, but to the resoun of god....

(I, pr. vi, 61-69, ed. Skeat, p. 22.)

Such passages raise the question at the start. Then take such a discussion as the following:

Thanne, whether that destinee be exercysed outhur by some divyne spirits, servaunts to the divyne purviaunce, or elles by som sowle, or elles by alle nature servinge to god, or elles by the celestial moevinges of sterres, or elles by the vertu of angeles...the destinal ordinaunce is y-woven and accomplisshed. Certes, it is open thing that the purviaunce is an unmoevable and simple forme of thinges to done....

(iv, pr. vi, 65-71, p. 116.)

¹ See *Mod. Philol.*, vii, pp. 465 ff. Cf. Miss Kitchel's paper in the *Vassar Mediæval Studies*, New Haven, 1923, pp. 219 ff. as to a source for the setting of the poem.

² The passage on Fortune in the *Book of the Duchesse* will be found in ll. 617 ff. It is hardly necessary here to give a full study of its sources, or to cite other studies of the kind, but see, in particular, *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America*, xxx, pp. 1 ff.

³ I shall not pause here to take up the structure of that poem in relation to its sources. One may consult Sypherd's *Studies in Chaucer's House of Fame*, London, 1907, Chaucer Soc., 2nd series, vol. xxxix; *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxiv, p. 323; *ibid.*, xxxiii, pp. 177 ff.; and A. Brusendorff, *The Chaucer Tradition*, London and Copenhagen, 1925, pp. 153 f., n. 3.

Add to it the illustration furnished by the wheel, with its centre of 'stable simplicitee of purviaunce' and its rim of 'moevable destinee¹,' and the conception is almost complete. This development the references in his own works seem to corroborate, as he reflects one suggestion after another which was ready for him in the Latin.

In the *Balade de Visage sanz Peinture*, in which, like Boethius, he holds a dialogue with Fortune, a striking example of this process occurs. The poem is sometimes dated late in his career², and that may be where it belongs; but, except perhaps for the Envoy, I should be inclined to place it shortly after the Boethius, and not far from the Prologue to the *Legende of Good Women* (in its first form), since in the *Balade* as well as the *Legende* he shows dependence on the writings of Deschamps³. The interesting feature to notice in this poem is that here Chaucer introduces the Christian conception, familiar in Dante, but apparently without the slightest trace of influence from the Italian. In giving an account of her own nature, Fortuna clears up the whole matter:

Lo, thexecucion of the magestee
That al purveyeth of his rightwisnesse,
That same thing 'Fortune' clepen ye,
Ye blinde bestes, ful of lewednesse!

(ll. 65-68.)

The poem was obviously not written to treat of philosophical subtleties, and yet it is significant that the question is dealt with. The moral is just what the poet wanted: he is in straitened circumstances, he implies, and like many a mortal he is tempted to believe that the gods are capricious with him; but he will not take his adversities in bad part—he grants that behind all these is a righteous God; and also, his best friend is still alive, and that's something! The poem is thus at once a pat on the shoulder and a tap on the back, and both without a coward's whine.

¹ iv, pr. vi, 81 ff. For the Latin see iv, pr. vi, 51 ff., etc., in the edition of Stewart and Rand, *Loeb Library*, London, 1918. Cf. also in Chaucer's translation the discussion regarding the beginnings of things, i, pr. vi, and that on the control of fortune (the abstraction), v, metr. i, 13-16.

² Bilderbeck's interpretation of the Envoy is accepted by Brusendorff (*The Chaucer Tradition*, pp. 199 f., n. 5). Some question remains, however, in the fact that the line which seems to reveal the date is missing in all MSS. but one. Notice that Brusendorff thinks that the whole Envoy of the *Balade de Bon Conseyl* is spurious (*ibid.*, pp. 246 ff.).

³ See Brusendorff, *op. cit.*, pp. 242 ff. Notice that Brusendorff suggests that Balades COLXXXVI-VII on Fortune accompanied the complimentary Balade (COLXXXV) to Chaucer (there is a misprint in the numbering of the Balades in his note, p. 244, n. 2). That Chaucer's reply to the complimentary poem was the use of material from Deschamps in the Prologue of the *Legende* was suggested by Kittredge, *Mod. Philol.*, i, p. 6; approved by Lowes, *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, xix, p. 641 and n. 1; and see *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxiii, p. 278, n. 35. Brusendorff does not seem to have noticed another Balade by Deschamps on the subject, Bal. CLX (*Œuvres*, Soc. des Anc. Textes Fr., i, pp. 289 f.) with a similar theme; and cf. the material in the *Miroir de Mariage*, ll. 1 ff. (*Œuvres*, ix, pp. 3 ff.). On the problem of the date, however, cf. Brusendorff, pp. 489 ff., with his doubtful suggestion for the *Legende* (neglecting the problem in *Cant. Tales*, B. 60 ff.), based, apparently, on the desire to posit only one volume from Deschamps; and cf. *Fortune*, l. 7 with the *Parson's Tale*, I, 248.

One might hold that this passage on Fortune is hardly more than the negation offered by the philosophers, as a sort of poetic embodiment of St Thomas's phrase: 'Non tamen bene usi sunt nomine fortunae¹.' In my opinion it is something more than that, however, and in any case it shows thought with regard to the problem. In the *Knight's Tale*, written not many years after the translation of Boethius, another solution is offered, similar, nevertheless, in many respects to that in the *Balade*. There is much about Fortune in Boccaccio's *Teseide*; but at the point where Duke Theseus comes upon Palamon and Arcite fighting their terrible duel in the grove, the use of the element of chance puts a heavy demand on poetic faith. Theseus happened to be out hunting, and the deer happened to take his course that way. If this were done in the spirit of pure romance, it would hardly matter; but Chaucer makes the plot too real for that. It is interesting to observe that a preposterous story is often carried less easily by the power of realism than by the illusion of romance, wherefore the mistake of some writers who try to rationalise absurdities. Boccaccio got round his difficulty by the method, rather startling here, of direct appeal: 'But as we sometimes see things happen that don't happen again for a thousand years...' etc. This passage Chaucer fortified by additions:

The destinee, ministre general,
That executeth in the world over-al
The purveyaunce, that God hath seyn biforn,
So strong it is, that, though the world had sworn
The contrarie of a thing, by ye or nay,
Yet somtyme it shal fallen on a day
That falleth nat eft with-inne a thousand yere. (A. 1663-69.)

Here there is something like the 'execucion of the magestee' referred to in the *Balade*, but the wording reminds one as well of the phraseology of Dante, where Fortune is 'general ministra e duce²,' and also of Boccaccio's expression 'L' alta ministra del mondo Fortuna,' in a passage³ which perhaps recalled Dante to Chaucer's mind in this connexion. Why then did he change the allusion from that to Fortune into the other to Destinee? Perhaps because he found his initial suggestion in Boethius⁴, where the full conception of the Christian Fortune is not presented, but where Destiny has many of the attributes ascribed to the fickle goddess. In this respect, therefore, the passage in the

¹ *Commentaria Physicorum Aristotelis (Opera)*, ed. Pope Leo XIII, II, p. 77, 9).

² *Inferno*, VII, 78.

³ *La Teseide*, VI, 1 ff. which echoes Dante. This occurs a little later than the scene corresponding to that in Chaucer where Destinee is mentioned. Cf. *Tes.*, v, stanza 77.

⁴ In Book IV, pr. vi, ll. 35 ff. (Chaucer's translation, ed. Skeat, p. 115) in a passage which Skeat cited for the corresponding lines about Fortune in the *Balade*. It is significant that both the *Balade* and the *Knight's Tale* seem to derive at least in part therefrom.

Knight's Tale seems earlier than that in the *Balade*, except for the echo of Dante; and one may suspect that the discussion in the *Consolation of Philosophy*, together with that in the *Inferno*, was what led Chaucer to his own ideas on the subject. Thus in recasting the plot of the *Teseide* he reduced the element of chance, and turned instead to a kind of fatalism, in which Palamon (unlike his prototype in the Italian) receives some degree of poetic justice. Even Arcite has his appropriate reward; for he wins the tournament, but fails to get the lady, on whom, after all, Palamon had prior claim. Arcite it was who broke the oath of brotherhood, and, following passion rather than loyalty, caused all the trouble. We like him rather better, I think, than we do Palamon, just because he is headlong. But we are bound to admit that he is subject to no irrational destiny, and that he has been touched, however slightly, with the follies of love and 'worldly vanitee.'

Another poem, and a much greater, in which Chaucer shows similar deliberations is the *Troilus*, written in the same general period. In the *Filostrato*, its source, the lovers come together of their own volition; and when Chaucer set about to rework it to his purpose, he found the element of chance in control, except, strangely enough, in the scene where Griseida, torch in hand, goes to meet Troilo and is in no point deceived about his intentions. But Chaucer's Criseyde cannot permit herself to act so simply. Candid as she usually is in facing the facts of life, nevertheless, like many a modern, 'To herself she must seem to have yielded only to inevitable fate; but to her lover she wished to be not a helpless victim but an offering of free love¹.' So she consents to go to her uncle's house, not without an inkling that Troilus may be found near by, and after supper, when she is about to leave, a storm happens to come up. She cannot go home again in the rain. It is at this juncture that Chaucer adds a passage about Fortune, which, it will be seen, recalls the other lines in the *Balade* and the *Knight's Tale*, and gives an indubitable portrait of the Christian figure:

But O, Fortune, executrice of wierdes,
 O influences of thise hevenes hye!
 Soth is, that, under God, ye ben our hierdes,
 Though to us bestes been the causes wrye. (III, 617-20.)

The idea of men as poor 'beasts' is like that in the *Balade*; the reference to the hidden causes makes one think of similar lines in Dante². Boethius,

¹ R. K. Root, *The Poetry of Chaucer*, Boston, 1922, p. 112.

² *Inferno*, VII, 82 ff. For 'executrice of wierdes' cf. the phrase in the Laurent de Premierfait translation of the *De Casibus*; see *Smith College Studies in Modern Languages*, IV, 4, pp. 35 ff.

too, is behind this passage, as we have seen in touching on the discussion of Destiny in the *Consolatio*. And the meaning is that the storm has arrived in accordance with a Divine plan and not through chance. This meaning is deepened if we observe a passage too often neglected in this connexion, where even before she goes to Pandarus's house Criseyde remarks: 'It rayneth; lo, how sholde I goon?' (III, 562). Soon after, she asks whether Troilus is out of town; and what she thinks at the reply of Pandarus, Chaucer is not prepared to say—at least so he tells us. In that way Criseyde seeks to delude herself and to be the willing victim of circumstances. The finesse with which this scene is developed gives us the proper parallel in lighter vein for such an episode as the murder of Raffles in *Middlemarch*, which requires even less than the proverbial twist of the wrist. Criseyde takes every precaution to guard her modesty, and does nothing else except just—to yield.

At the next crisis in the story, at the moment when Criseyde is unfaithful to Troilus, Fortune is again held responsible, but again she is described as only the agent of God's will. Through her it is brought about that Troilus suffers his great loss and Diomedes receives favour (IV, Stanzas 1-2). The fate of Troy, which so deeply involves that of the lovers, really lies in the hands of Fortune:

Fortune, whiche that permutacioun
Of thinges hath, as it is hir committed
Through purveyaunce and disposicioun
Of heighe Iove, as regnes shal ben flitted
Fro folk in folk, or whan they shal ben smitted,
Gan pulle away the fetheres brighte of Troye
Fro day to day, til they ben bare of Iove.

(v, 1541-47.)

But again it is exceedingly important to notice that neither of the lovers is helpless in the matter: their debate about the wisdom of separating at least temporarily shows their free choice on that point; Criseyde takes her time, not too much perhaps, but a judicious amount, in yielding to Diomedes; and Troilus, first tempted to put the blame on circumstances like many another, finally sees his own deliberate part in his tragedy¹. The business of Fortune, in this case as in the other,

¹ This phase of the situation is fully discussed in a study of Troilus's monologue on predestination, *Journ. Eng. Germ. Phil.*, xvii, pp. 399 ff. (see also *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xl, pp. 270 ff.). Such a tragedy as this is a sufficient answer to Farnham's theory about Renaissance developments, *Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxv, pp. 66 ff. As a matter of fact the idea that man may be master of his fate is essential to scholastic philosophy, and touches mediæval plots about as often as it does those of later periods. The development has not been in the direction of richer significance in tragedy, but, especially since the late seventeenth century, the sentimental type has more and more dominated the stage. It seems likely that with the growth of modern determinism this will continue to be the case, although it is amusing to see the determinist trying to straddle both positions: cf. F. H. Hankins, *Journ. Philos.*, xxii, pp. 617 ff.

is therefore to prepare the way for the deliberate act of Criseyde. The opportunity for self-expression includes the expression of weakness as well as of strength. The philosophical tradition of Fortune from the time of Aristotle maintained that chance makes room for human free will. So Criseyde is unfaithful—honest with herself when it comes to desire, even to the point of being unscrupulous in the expression of it (Chaucer's harshest treatment of her is in the quality of her letter, v, 1590 ff., especially 1614 f., and in the comment on her gift of the brooch, v, 1040); but she tries her old trick of self-deception when it comes to blame in the matter, only to discover that this time it won't work. 'To Diomedes algate I wol be trewe' (v, 1071)! Henryson in writing his *Testament of Cresseid* saw the implications of that line; the girl who had looked facts in the face with all the 'calculinge' worthy of her father Calchas had descended to such futility!

The passage about Fortune quoted above shows again the indebtedness to Boethius and the echo of the other passages, in the *Knight's Tale* and perhaps in the *Balade*, together with a marked dependence this time on Dante¹. Clearly the poet was interested in the problem of chance in the decade after 1378. Reading Boethius stirred his consideration of the matter; but after the death of Edward III England was politically in a turmoil, with the peasant revolt, the difficulties following the succession of young Richard, the rise of Lollardy, and a touch of warfare to add to the excitement. Moreover, Chaucer's personal fortunes had their ups and downs at this time. One has only to scan the events that mark this period in his life, with his loss of the Controllershship of the Customs and that of the Petty Customs, and the connexion of his affairs with the rise and fall of Mayor Brembre, to see that his thoughts might well turn on:

The pow'r that ministers to God's decrees,
And executes on earth what Heaven foresees,
Call'd Providence, or Chance, or Fatal Sway².

What seems like a reversion to the pagan idea appears in another of Chaucer's poems, the *Monk's Tale*. Here various 'world figures' are described, from Lucifer and Adam to Croesus and Julius Cæsar, and one after another their stories are told: how with unware stroke Fortune assailed them. Like the *Mirror for Magistrates* of a later century, the plan of the narrative is to show the 'slipery deceiptes of the wavering

¹ *Inferno*, vii, 79-80. This is the passage reflected in the *Teseide*, vi, 1 ff. Note also Chaucer's lines which embody a Christian idea of Fate, as in the *Knight's Tale*, but here in the persons of the Parcae, *Troilus*, v, 1 ff.

² Dryden, *Palamon and Arcite*, ii, ll. 210-12.

lady,' although not always to exhibit the 'due rewarde of all kinde of vices'; for both documents take account of the fact that Fortune does not limit herself to the punishment of sin. The Monk tries to explain her deeds in this way; but as he goes on with his succession of pathetic episodes it is clear that in the case of Sampson, Zenobia, and especially Peter of Spain (John of Gaunt's father-in-law) we have sentimental tragedies, where the main point is our expected grief. This is the pagan goddess who does her business here, covering her face against both the unjust and the just. Perhaps the story came early in Chaucer's career; but apparently some of the sentimental tragedies did not. And, in any event, why did he allow it to appear unchanged among the *Canterbury Tales*?

The answer is to be found, I feel sure, in the character of the Monk. He is a prime sentimentalist himself. Somewhat modern in his point of view on things religious, holding after the new way, he maintained that life was meant to be enjoyed. What an excellent time he had in the process of enjoying it! Full many a dainty horse he had, and his bridle jingled with bells to keep music for ever in the air; his sleeves were lined with fur at the wrist, and that the finest of the land; his hood was fastened with an elaborate pin in the shape of a love-knot; his boots were supple and easy on the soft flesh of his feet; his skin is full fair; he is sleek, well fed, and knows the flavour of a fat swan. Constraint is not for him, but license and pleasure. There is no more emancipated worthy in literature until we come to Browning's Bishop ordering his own tomb with Renaissance grace. Another figure like this Monk might have told less moral stories, and have kept more assiduously to happy endings. But such a man would have been the less skilful in draining life's sensations dry. This Monk knows how to squeeze the juice even out of pathos and to feel the respectable luxury of piety.

So with magnificent pomp, with morality based in his own case on pride, he tells these moral stories, in which pride is castigated—or else is not—but, whether or no, we are led to feel deeply saddened by the cruelty of circumstance, and the Host is incidentally rebuked for imputing evil ways to this honourable dignitary. At last only the Knight can interrupt this rosary of tears; and the Host gets his chance to give proper criticism, using the very words of the Monk, and adding:

No remedie
It is for to biwaille, ne compleyne
That that is doon, and als it is a peyne,
As ye han seyde, to here of hevynesse.

(B. 3974-77.)

The Monk himself is reduced to mortification by the turn of events. The Host makes fun of the very style of his speech. When his most affecting mood is broken into thus harshly, like any sentimentalist he is sullen, and like any sentimentalist he insists that he himself has been deeply moved all along. He won't tell another story:

'Nay,' quod this monk, 'I have no lust to pleye.' (B. 3996.

Some years before the Monk told this story on the way to Canterbury Chaucer himself may have taken Boccaccio's moral treatise in earnest. In a serious mood he may have set about translating the *De Casibus* because it was edifying. But he apparently did not finish the work, and later, as in the case of the *Melibeus* and the story of Griselda, he saw it in a different light. In this way it becomes transformed for us in the *Canterbury Tales*, and the Monk, in giving forth the tragedies as monotonously as the tolling of his chapel bell, only shows his own character¹.

Fortune reappears in the other *Canterbury Tales*. In the *Man of Law's Tale* there is a suggestion of the Christian figure², although astrological influence receives more attention. In the *Nun's Priest's Tale*, as if by way of glancing back at the Monk, we are told that Fortune turns the hope and pride of her enemy³. In the *Clerk's Tale* the whims of Fortune really seem to be the design of Walter in testing his wife. In the *Merchant's Tale*, after an ironical allusion⁴, the goddess seems to work the will of a sane and prudent Fate. She separates the lovers in the *Squire's Tale*; and a complaint is addressed to her in the *Franklin's Tale*, although ultimately her action seems fair enough. The *Parson's Tale* has some material on her gifts, but shows nothing particularly new. Other instances might be cited, but from these which I have passed in review we obtain sufficient information about the poet's attitude.

In brief, Fortune's gifts are 'richesses, highe degrees of lordshipes, preisinges of the peple⁵,' and obviously sometimes success in love. These she doles out, subject to a rational Deity, whose plan she puts in operation. In the *Balade de Bon Conseyl*, in advising men not to kick against

¹ Lydgate translated Boccaccio's work later from the French version of Laurent de Premierfait. From the latter he seems to have got the Christian conception of Fortune. Of their ideas the most recent editor says: 'The most that may be said of either of them is that he was able to recognize that, in general, men reap what they have sown,' Early Eng. Text Soc., *Lydgate's Fall of Princes*, London, 1924, I, p. xxii.

² B. II. 447 ff. Cf. the *Melibeus*, sections 41 ff. (Skeat, p. 223).

³ B. II. 4593 ff.

⁴ E. II. 2057 ff. with the familiar scorpion figure.

⁵ *Parson's Tale*, section 27, 454 (Skeat, p. 596).

the pricks but to seek that peace which is found in truth, Chaucer warns them to keep from putting any confidence in Fortune. The moral of the problem, therefore, is to turn away from her double face to the God who 'nil falsen no wight¹.' In this he is in accord with the French poets, Philippe de Beaumanoir, Watriquet de Couvin, and others, and with Boethius and Dante. With him and with Dante tragedy gains in significance, for in their telling it becomes moral rather than sentimental, and the moral values attain a spiritual validity in the philosophy which they both hold. The universe, as they see it, is neither surrendered to the workings of chance, nor given up to the laws of blind fate which ultimately are just as capricious in their effect on man. Instead it is based on intelligence, and that is how one may hold the conviction that 'Trouthe shal delivere, hit is no drede².' Chaucer's counsel implies a belief in free will, and, at the very opposite pole from cynicism, a sure hope in the meaning of existence.

HOWARD R. PATCH.

NORTHAMPTON, MASS., U.S.A.

¹ *Troilus*, v, 1845.

² *Balade de Bon Conseyl*, l. 7, etc.

'A CURE FOR A CUCKOLD' BY HEYWOOD, ROWLEY AND WEBSTER

A Cure for a Cuckold was published in quarto in 1661 by Francis Kirkman, and attributed by him to John Webster and William Rowley. Though Kirkman's word is so often to be disregarded, it is generally thought that in this instance he told the truth. The subplot, mostly in prose, is usually assigned to Rowley and the main plot to Webster. On a re-examination of the play I am convinced that it was written mainly by Rowley, with three scenes by Webster and four by Heywood. It is upon general considerations of style that I based my conviction in dividing the play; but on comparing my results with those of Stoll¹ and Sykes², I find that their evidence for Webster centres almost wholly around the scenes I had picked out for his. The abundant evidence submitted by these critics has placed beyond reasonable doubt Webster's part authorship of *A Cure for a Cuckold*; but indications of an author in one scene of a composite play are of course no proof whatever that he wrote the scenes in which these indications do not appear. And if the scenes in which they are absent contain evidence of another writer, the conclusion is quite obvious. All the significant parallels offered by Stoll and practically all of those presented by Sykes are drawn from III, i, IV, ii, and V, i b; and I wholly agree that these scenes are Webster's. But I differ from both of these scholars in that I believe Webster's contribution to be confined to these three scenes, with probably some slight touches of revision elsewhere, such as we should naturally expect in a work of joint composition. Mr Sykes finds two or three Webster parallels in the subplot scenes; but these possible indications that Webster may have gone over Rowley's work, pen in hand, do not greatly concern me. My purpose is to show that it was Heywood and not Webster who wrote I, i and ii, III, iii b, and V, i a; and that Rowley in addition to the subplot wrote the whole of Act II and the final scene of the drama.

To clear the way for Heywood I must first consider the argument for Webster submitted by Mr Sykes so far as it involves the Heywood scenes. Mr Sykes was the first scholar to call attention in print to the Heywood words in *A* and *V* and *C for C*³. As Heywood's hand had at

¹ E. E. Stoll, *John Webster*, 1905.

² *Notes and Queries*, S. 11, ix (1914).

³ Abbreviations: *A* and *V*, *Appius and Virginia*; *W D*, *The White Devil*; *D M*, *The Duchess of Malfi*; *C for C*, *A Cure for a Cuckold*; *D L C*, *The Devil's Law Case*; *C for B*,

that time not been suspected, Mr Sykes naturally attributed these words to Webster's borrowing. Rupert Brooke also noted the Heywood words in the former drama, and based upon them, chiefly, a claim for Heywood's authorship¹. In both plays, however, the words occur in just those scenes which on other and better grounds may be confidently assigned to Heywood. I have elsewhere² considered the case of *A and V*. In *C for C* they come in the scenes I have named above as his, and I take them as a first claim for Heywood's authorship. These words are: *monomachy*, *mediate*, *unite consent*, *aspersed*, and *apology* (as a verb)³.

Mr Sykes notes also some not unusual but favourite words of Webster's which appear in *C for C*. Some of these do not come in the Heywood scenes, and so do not concern us. *Noble* and *strange* are the most in evidence of these words; but to show that they were also favourite words with Heywood I add to Mr Sykes's counting in the three Webster plays the number of their occurrences in three plays of Heywood:

| | Webster | | | Heywood | | |
|----------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|----------------|----------------|
| | <i>W D</i> | <i>D M</i> | <i>D L C</i> | <i>E T</i> | <i>C for B</i> | <i>2 F M W</i> |
| <i>noble</i> | 17 | 24 | 27 | 18 | 41 | 36 |
| <i>strange</i> | 16 | 7 | 26 | 10 | 10 | 16 |

The other words in the Heywood scenes are also Heywood words. The scenes in question furnish also a number of Heywood's favourite words which seldom or never appear in Webster: *courtesy*, *modesty* (Heywood is for ever dwelling upon these; they did not apparently interest Webster in the least), *labyrinth*, *solemnities* (festivals), *opinioned*, *discontent*. Twice in *i*, *i*, comes the response to jesting friends, 'You are pleasant.' Heywood uses this almost as frequently as Fletcher, but Webster always uses 'merry' instead of 'pleasant' in this sense. 'Choice beauties' and 'a choice beauty' in the same scene recall 'choice beauties' and 'choicest beauties' in *M W L* (102, 259)⁴ and *E T* (11), as well as 'choice gentlewomen,' 'choice friend,' etc., frequently. Mr Sykes quotes the lines from *i*, *ii*,

Thy dulness sads the half part of the house,
And deads that spirit which thou wast wont to quicken,

A Challenge for Beauty; *E T*, *The English Traveller*; *F M W*, *The Fair Maid of the West*; *F by L and S*, *Fortune by Land and Sea*; *L L W*, *The Late Lancashire Witches*; *M W L*, *A Maidenhead Well Lost*; *R K*, *Royal King and Loyal Subject*; *R L*, *The Rape of Lucrece*; *P D and D*, *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramas*; *S A*, *The Silver Age*; *W K K*, *A Woman Killed with Kindness*.

¹ John Webster and the Elizabethan Drama, 1916.

² *Studies in Philology*, forthcoming.

³ One of the words cited by Mr Sykes, *ecstasied*, comes in a Webster scene, *iv*, *ii*, but Webster uses this word in *D L C*. Another, *gratulate*, is in a Rowley scene, *ii*, *iv*, but Rowley uses this word in *A Fair Quarrel*. These two words must therefore be stricken from the list.

⁴ Page references to the Pearson edition: for the Webster plays, to the Dyce one volume edition.

and offers a Webster parallel for *sad* and *dead* as verbs. But this use of *sad* is taken from a Heywood scene (according to my division of the play) in *A and V*, and Heywood has it again in *S A* (218), 'Yet sad us not.' It does not occur in Webster. Heywood also uses *glad* as a verb in *S A*, in *Pericles* (three times), in *R K*, and elsewhere. *Dead*, as a verb, is very rare. I do not recall it in Heywood. He has, however, *sick*, as a verb (*P D and D*, 289) which is almost, if not quite, as unusual.

The vocabulary test for the four scenes is, therefore, rather in Heywood's favour than in Webster's. Mr Sykes has little else in these scenes to support Webster's claim. He calls attention to the rime, *sin-been*, which occurs twice in Webster; but glancing down the couplets of *P D and D*, I find it there four times (122, 145, 163, 183). He gives the parallel,

You are grateful above merit. (C for C, III, iii b)
We are happy above thought, because 'bove merit. (W D, 6)

But Heywood comes closer with

You are grateful, sir, beyond my merit, (2 F M W, 392)

and

You are most grateful,
And much beyond my merit. (F by L and S, 432)

It is equally like Heywood to say, 'You all speak nobly' (I, ii); and Contarino's saying to Ercole, 'Why, you speak nobly' (*D L C*, 117) may be matched, if that is necessary, by 'Nobly have you spoke' (*Captives*, v, iii), and several instances in Heywood where we have, as here, the general commendation that all have done well, or all have spoken well. The only other parallel given by Mr Sykes is for 'strange distraction,' and again I offer a counter, though in this case a slightly different one:

Will breed a strange distraction. (C for C, I, ii)
That breeds all this distraction. (P D and D, 293)

This completes Mr Sykes's showing for the four scenes. It leaves us, I think, with no evidence for Webster which is not overbalanced by similar evidence for Heywood. Let us now briefly note some of the more distinctive indications that *A Cure for a Cuckold* was another of the 220 plays in which the author of *The English Traveller* had had 'at the least a main finger.'

With the first line of the opening scene:

This is a place of feasting and of joy,

we find ourselves in the presence of an author who wrote with easy

buoyancy. Throughout the scenes I have assigned to Heywood the verse is full-toned and regular, the natural and easy output of a facile poet. The expression is never clogged by a sudden turn of thought, never involved from an unexpected reach of the imagination, never 'spurdy' from the force of a pent-up emotion that did not easily find utterance. It is adequate and dignified verse, carrying a faint poetic glow. Webster did not write in this friendly and open-hearted manner; his style suggests no amiability, no suave and genial attitude of mind, no complacency, no glibness. We should know that he was a slow worker even if we had not been told. The versification of the four scenes seems to me to exhibit none whatever of the characteristics of Webster, and to be entirely like that of Heywood in his last period. But opinions are not arguments, and I must support my case by facts.

There is one distinct difference between Heywood's verse and Webster's which can be tabulated, and it applies in every drama of the two men that has come down to us. This difference consists in the use of anapæsts. The contrast between the two styles seems to be due very largely to the difference that must exist between a verse that contains many extra syllables and one that has but few. If, now, we bring together the percentages of extra syllables where the epical cæsure does not negate the anapæstic effect in *C for C* and in a play of the same period of Heywood and of Webster, the result will be found almost startling: in Webster's share of *C for C* 29.5 per cent., in *D L C* 29.8 per cent.; in Heywood's share of *C for C* only 9.5 per cent.; in *E T* 9.3 per cent. There is no act in *E T* that varies more than 1 per cent. from the total average; and there is no scene in *D L C* in which the percentage comes within or near Heywood's range—within or near the limits set by the four scenes of *C for C*. The regularity of Webster's practice in this particular may be noted in the fourth column of the appended table. The figures are those given by Professor Stoll (*op. cit.*, p. 190) except for *A and V*, where I have substituted my own counting in the scenes which I regard as Webster's, and in the Webster scenes in *C for C*.

| | Percentages | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------|
| | Run-on lines | L. and w. endings | Ep. cæs. | Ex. syl. exclus. ep. cæs. | Fem. endings | Ratio 2-word | Rime |
| <i>A and V</i> (W scenes) | 32.0 | 0.0 | 2.83 | 16.0 | 27.0 | 13.0 | 8.9 |
| <i>W D</i> | 36.28 | 0.32 | 2.88 | 18.6 | 31.4 | 10.84 | 4.5 |
| <i>D M</i> | 49.95 | 0.95 | 5.0 | 35.5 | 32.6 | 20.0 | 2.1 |
| <i>D L C</i> | 35.8 | 0.76 | 5.5 | 29.8 | 32.6 | 15.75 | 1.03 |
| <i>C for C</i> (W scenes) | 40.2 | 0.77 | 6.6 | 29.5 | 33.6 | 25.4 | 2.3 |
| <i>C for C</i> (entire) | 28.88 | 1.56 | 1.4 | 10.9 | 19.5 | 14.76 | 1.17 |

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Webster adhered to his custom and wrote the scenes in which his characteristics remain constant, and that he did not depart from it in the remaining scenes, which exhibit the characteristics of a different type of poet. If, as Dr Stoll suggests, Webster was deliberately adopting another style, there would not be this disparity within the play itself.

Another characteristic of Webster is to be found in his liberal use of contractions¹. They are abundant everywhere in his work. Heywood, except in his latest plays, is sparing in his use even of the common *t*-contractions (*see't*, *do't*, etc.), and avoids *i'the* and *o'the* almost altogether. It is of more than passing significance that in the four scenes, 515 lines, Heywood has only five *t*-contractions and none of *i'the* or *o'the*; while in Webster's three scenes, 470 lines, there are 36 contractions, of which 16 are of the latter sort.

One may observe also in the four scenes many of Heywood's characteristics as a playwright. Lessingham, enjoined by Clare to kill his dearest friend, soliloquizes:

O, to what a monster
Would this trans-shape me,—to be made that he
To violate such goodness!

One recalls at once *W K K*, *R L*, and *E T*, where we have kindred instances of such soliloquizing. He continues:

I'm full of thoughts, and this my troubled breast
Distempered with a thousand fantasies.

Heywood's heroes are for ever troubled and perplexed in this fashion—or so they say. Lessingham's line, later in the scene,

Had you confirmed it with a thousand oaths,

reminds us again of Heywood's fondness for these numerical hyperboles. In 2 *F M W*, for example, we have *a thousand dangers*, *a thousand honours*, *a thousand deaths*, *a thousand projects*, *a thousand throes*, *a thousand fears*, *a thousand deaths* (repeated), *a thousand turbulent griefs*, and again *a thousand dangers*. The naïve and theatrical presentation of the plot is also quite in Heywood's manner. Lessingham's four friends protest their readiness to do anything for him; and then, learning that it means endangering their lives, each one sidesteps in turn; but the 'dearest' friend, Bonville, though about to be married, throws himself boldly into the breach. It recalls the old morality, *Everyman*; it certainly does not recall the dramaturgy of John Webster. The Captain in *R K* is deserted by each of his friends in turn to set in

¹ The value of contractions as a test of authorship was pointed out by Farnham, *Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America*, xxxi, p. 326.

contrast the faithful devotion of his servant and of the lady he loves. The Roman officers in *R L* ride home to see how their wives are behaving; each of the others is frivolling, but Lucrece is a shining example of perfect domesticity. It is Heywood's idea of 'heart appeal' to set off his noble characters in this artificial fashion. To heighten the situation, Bonville's beloved trips in just at the moment when her lover is agreeing to hazard his life, and worries lest her carcanet is lost. The lost carcanet plays an important part in *C for B*.

In III, iii b, beginning with the entrance of Woodroff and Rochfield, we have Heywood's characteristic account of the sea-fight. I do not understand how I could ever have read that description and supposed that it was Webster's. There is the frequent change of tense, as in *The Shipwreck*, the opening dialogue in *P D and D*, and as is usual in Heywood's longer narrations. There is the modest refusal of the hero to recount his exploits and the generous giving of all the credit to the other man, both of which are Heywoodian features. There is the parallel,

Never was, gentlemen,
A sea-fight better managed. (C for C, III, iii b)
a sea-fight
Was never better managed. (F by L and S, 411)

And the ending of the scene brings a dozen memories and a smile: 'We will in and feast.' Heywood never lets that opportunity go by.

In v, i a, there is the trivial parallel, 'Thanks, occasion,' with 'Occasion, I thank thee' in *C for B*, 37; and this, which is more significant:

Less. May I beg your name?
Roch. 'Tis that I never yet denied to any,
Nor will to you that seem a gentleman (C for C, v, i a)
Of England? Your name Ferrers?
Fer. Rather than deny
My name and country, I'd.... (C for B, 24)

These are only two of the many instances in Heywood in which the enquiry of the name is combined with an emphasis on birth or family. The rescued Bess desires formally to know

...unto what worthy person,
Of what degree or state I owe the service...; (2 F M W, 390)

and everywhere there is the same concern with rank, a concern not the least characteristic of Webster. In the Dedication of *E T*, and in other dedications, where he speaks in his own name, as well as constantly in his plays, Heywood carefully elaborates on this theme. The name Bonville must have seemed to him particularly appropriate, for in *R K* he employs it again:

Unless he be a gentleman, and Bonville
Is by his birth no less. (R K, 40)

This brings us to Rochfield's aside beginning,

Some plot to wrong the bride; and I now
Will marry craft with cunning: if he bite,
I'll give him line to play on.

Mr Sykes has a parallel for 'give him line,' and this particular bit is like Webster. Moreover, the anapaests and contractions begin to appear at this point. I think, however, that Webster merely revised a speech or two here in preparation for his continuation of the scene a few lines later; for we are quickly back again with Heywood in

I hear you two call cousins: comes your kindred
By the Woodroffs or the Bonviles?

To Lessingham's comment on the carcanet Rochfield replies, "'Tis confessed.' This rather unusual response is not in Webster but occurs in the opening scene of this drama, in *L L W* (190), *E T* (52), *P D and D* (247), and *The Captives*, I, ii, 52. Mr Sykes gives as a parallel for the next line, 'What I have said, I have said,' Webster's 'What I have done, I have done,' in *D M*; but I cannot grant this as a count for Webster inasmuch as Heywood has 'What I have done, I ha' done' in *L L W* (229). I should extend Heywood's share to the couplet which follows, since Heywood ends each of his scenes in this play with a couplet (other rimes scarcely occur in it), and with the approach of Woodroff we have at once Webster's style and the theme of his previous scenes, III, i, and IV, ii. (I have excluded as composite, in my countings given above, the last eight speeches of V, i a.)

In turning from Act I to Act II we find ourselves in a wholly different atmosphere. The metrical contrast between the opening lines of each act,

This is a place of feasting and of joy, (I, i)
A younger brother! 'tis a poor calling, (II, i)

is essentially the contrast that we find between the whole of Act I and the whole of Act II. But the verse of Act II, while so different from that of Act I, does not to me suggest Webster. It seems to me essentially the same verse that we find in the subplot and in Rowley's share of *A Fair Quarrel*. Take, for example, such typical lines as these:

I do assure
You would not strike my head off for my chain,
Nor my hand for this: how to deliver 'em
Otherwise I know not. Accompany
Me back unto my house, 'tis not far off:
By all the vows which this day I have tied
Unto my wedded husband, the honour....

Everyone knows the roughness, almost uncouthness, of Rowley's verse. It reads, at times, so much like prose that one wonders if prose was

not intended (these particular lines were, indeed, originally printed as prose). Rowley was extraordinarily careless or else his ear was curiously defective. When his verse is regular it is still amateurish, prevailingly end-stopped, and devoid of Webster's frequent anapæsts. Miss Wiggin, in her excellent *Inquiry into the Authorship of the Middleton-Rowley Plays*, finds that he seldom has over 25 per cent. of run-on lines or of feminine endings; that he frequently inverts the second and last feet, and is careless of the number of unaccented syllables in the line. These characteristics appear throughout Act II and, to a somewhat less marked degree, in v, ii. There are in these scenes of the main plot (II, i, ii, and iv, and v, ii) slightly less than 20 per cent. of run-on lines and slightly less than 22 per cent. of feminine endings. Note the contrast of this to Webster's plays in the table given above. Inversion in the second foot, and less frequently in the last foot, is distinctly in evidence. The varying number of unaccented syllables produces Rowley's characteristically rough verse. It is impossible to give exact figures for the proportion of unmetrical lines, for often when one stumbles over a line one finds that by reaccenting it, it can be brought into the metrical swing. An approximate estimate of the unmetrical lines in *C for C* gives Heywood 1.3 per cent., Webster 3.5 per cent., and Rowley 18.5 per cent. Rowley's proportion of extra syllables exclusive of the epical cæsura is only 8.2 per cent., and here again he stands in distinct contrast to Webster.

I have not looked for Rowley parallels in these scenes. I note his favourite 'Though I say it' in II, iv (*Fair Quarrel*, Dedication and II, ii, *The Changeling*, I, i, *A Shoemaker a Gentleman*, II, i). There is in the same scene his characteristic giving of money by various people in turn. There is a parallel in:

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| I will discourse to you fine fancies. | |
| Fine fooleries, will you not? | (<i>C for C</i> , III, iii a) |
| There's fatal prophecies forbid you. | |
| There's fatal fooleries. | (<i>All's Lost by Lust</i> , v, i, 140) |

And there is the absence of subtlety and the simplicity of motivation justly attributed to Rowley by Miss Wiggin. Certainly Rochfield and Annabel, as they behave in Act II, are not Websterian characterizations.

The genius of John Webster has always been recognized in his two great plays; and relatively poor as *The Devil's Law Case* is, it shows in a different type of drama his essential characteristics. But critical opinion of his work has been frequently confused by the attribution to him of *A and V* and *C for C* in their entirety. These are not plays to

be despised, but our view of Webster will be much clarified if we assign to him only those scenes of which he was the author. We find him in III, i of *C for C* dealing with Heywood's situation as that pleasant borrower had taken it over from his sources, and treating it with more intensity and subtlety than Heywood ever manifested. This scene, in which Lessingham tells Bonville that he has brought him here to kill him, with Bonville's evasion of the encounter, is worthy of a place beside the much-admired scene between Ercole and Contarino in *D L C*. Except for a brief aside of Clare's in III, iii a, this theme does not appear again until IV, ii; and here again the presence of Webster becomes instantly apparent, and the clash of character on character that makes great drama is again in evidence. In V, i b, the situation is resumed, to be resolved in a few lines in the final scene. But here Webster's work appears to me rather like a revision of Rowley's than his own first-hand creation. It is essentially Webster's verse, but the characterization is not beyond Rowley's reach. These considerations, together with the slight indications of Webster's revision elsewhere, lead me to think that Webster was more probably the reviser of the piece than one of its original authors, and that Heywood and Rowley wrote this drama together, as they did *Fortune by Land and Sea*. After Clare's story gives place to Annabel's in V, i, we still have Webster's verse; but here, no longer writing of the Lessingham-Clare-Bonville story, his work becomes much more perfunctory. The expression, 'strangely off o' the hinges,' carried over from III, iii a, and the discussion about altering the will, suggest that Rowley has been rather thinly overlaid. Some revision by Webster in the concluding scene also confuses, I think, the distinction between the two writers; for there is not in Act V the striking contrast that Webster's III, i, and IV, ii, present to Rowley's Act II. Fundamentally, however, I judge V, i b, to be Webster's and V, ii, Rowley's; and the metrical tests bear this out.

HENRY DAVID GRAY.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA, U.S.A.

PROBLEMS OF FRENCH WORD-FORMATION¹

'VERMOULU' AND ITS FAMILY

HERE is Littré's explanation of this word: '*Ver, et moulu: moulu par les vers; Berry, vermoulu; wall. viermoyeu; bourg. varmôlu.*' His first example is from Beaumanoir, *Coutumes*, xxxviii, 19: '*s'on voit le fust du pressoir vies ou vermolu.*' The *Dictionnaire Général* gives the same etymology and the same quotation. Nothing could be simpler; like English *worm-eaten* it is composed of a verb preceded by a noun of agency, and thus merits enrolment in Darmesteter's list. 'From *vermibus molutus*,' says Ménage, and neither Littré nor Darmesteter takes us any farther. But the beauty of this simple design vanishes if we but glance at the history of the word and its family, and the tangled pattern which there confronts us leads us to question the adequacy of such a pleasingly obvious equation as: *vermoulu* = 'moulu par les vers.'

Before setting forth the main features of this history, as far as we have been able to reconstitute it, we would make two preliminary remarks. In the first place, we note that the word stands out from among its fellows in Darmesteter's list, inasmuch as it is a participle with no infinitive, or rather, with an infinitive of a different conjugation, *se vermouler*, and also because it is the only compound where the first element is a living agent, that is to say, where 'par' (les vers) and not 'avec' (du sel, la main, etc.) is to be understood. Secondly, we would observe, although the force of this will only be felt later, when the reader is familiar with the various equivalents and alternative forms of the word, that to say of a piece of wood that it has been *moulu*, 'milled' or 'ground' by worms, is, in itself, rather strange, and scarcely a spontaneous popular creation, because in early times, as with simple folk to-day, worms (or grubs) are considered as begetting themselves² within the object, and the attribute applied to the object thus affected is usually one connoting a condition ('worminess') of the object itself, produced, so to speak, from within, rather than a modification imposed by an extraneous agency; the modern reflexive verb *se vermouler* is itself a good illustration of this: '*ce bois est sujet à se vermouler.*'

We turn now to the history of the word. It appears as early as the thirteenth century, accompanied, in Beaumanoir's *Coutumes*, ch. xxxviii,

¹ Continued from p. 284.

² Cf. *infra*, p. 400, n. 4.

§ 1141 (ed. Salmon), by its noun *vermouleure*: 'par viesure¹ ou par *vermouleure*.' The noun has the appearance of being somewhat of a rarity at this period, as an important group of manuscripts² rejects it and replaces it by *molineure*³, a substantive derived from the verb *moliner*, 'to soften,' 'to become powdery,' which exists to-day in certain regions⁴ as a term applied to soil becoming powdery through heat, and in standard French in the expression *bois mouliné* (Littré and *Dict. Gén.*) 'bois attaqué par les vers,' and *cire moulinée* (Littré) 'cire en parcelles.'

After the thirteenth century we lose trace of the word and its family until the sixteenth, when we discover quite a plethora of forms, notably, a verb with three forms for the infinitive and three forms for the participle.

Palsgrave (1530)⁵ has the following quaint but significant entry: 'I kanker, as brasse or any other metall cankereth. *Je vermoulys, jay vermouly, vermoulyr*. I fynde also *je vermoulus* for the present and indiffynite indycatyve, and *jay vermoulu*. This potte is kankred, it is not holsome to sethe meate in: ce pot est *vermoulu*, il nest pas sayn pour cuire de la viande dedens.' 'Kankred as brasse or other metal—m. *vermolu* s. f. *vermolue* s.' For Palsgrave, therefore, the infinitive is *vermouli*, a neuter verb, the pres. and pret. indicative is *je vermoulis* or *je vermoulus*, the participle either *vermouli* or *vermoulu*, and most noteworthy of all, the adjective *vermolu* is detached from the verb, given a different spelling from the participle and treated as a separate word⁶.

We have full confirmation of Palsgrave's infinitive *vermouli*; for example, in Robert Estienne's *Dict. Latino-Gallicum* (1543), where *vermiculor* is translated by: '*se vermouli*, quand dedens le bois s'engendre (*sic*) de petits vers et le gastent,' in the same author's *Dictionnaire Français-Latin* (1549)⁷: '*Se vermouli*, *Vermiculari*, *Cariem trahere vel*

¹ Varr. 'par envie seur ce, p. pouretoure de villesche, p. enviesir, p. enviesseure.'

² The earliest of the *vermouleure* group is early fourteenth or late thirteenth century; the earliest of the *molineure* group is late fourteenth.

³ Godefroy, who used Beugnot's edition of Beaumanoir, where the word *molineure* stands in the text, wrongly translates it by 'mouvement de rotation.' His other examples of the word should have put him right.

⁴ See Jaubert, *Glossaire du Centre de la France*.

⁵ P. 596 of the *Doc. Hist. de France* edition.

⁶ As to the meaning given to the word by Palsgrave, I have no explanation to offer. I have met with no other example of the word being applied to metals. Whatever the explanation may be, it provides confirmation that the word at one period, or in certain circles, had a much wider application than that implied in the accepted etymology. The nearest parallel to P.'s example is in the term *verroilleure*, 'verdigris,' of which there is one example, dated 1555, in Godefroy.

⁷ The date of the first edition, which I have been unable to lay hands on, is said to be 1539.

sentire' (copied, with the two following articles: Fort *vermoulu*, cariosus and *Vermoulissure*, Caries cariei, by Nicot in his *Tresor*), and in Cotgrave's entry: 'se *vermouli*r, to grow worme-eaten, mouldie, rotten.' But (se) *vermouli*r is not the only infinitive known to the sixteenth century. The same Robert Estienne whom we have just quoted in support of the form *vermouli*r, gives us the earliest example of the modern form *se vermouler*¹. In the first edition of his *Thesaurus*, which was published in 1531, one year after Palsgrave's dictionary, we read: 'Cariem trahere, *se vermouler* et pourrir de vieillesse.' Later, we find the word in the first revision of Furetière's dictionary (1701), in the first edition of Trévoux (1704)², and ultimately (in 1762) in the Dictionary of the Academy. Estienne gives us further the participle (or adjective) *vermoulé*: 'Cariosus, fort *vermoulé*, pourri, corrompu de vieillesse,' which is to be contrasted with his entry: 'Cariosus, adjectivum, Fort *vermoulu*, pourri et corrompu,' in the *Dict. Latino-Gallicum* (1543)³ where he gives the form we find in Palsgrave, Nicot and Cotgrave.

As for the noun, the ancient form survives as *vermoulu*, attested in 1587 (Lanoue, cit. Littré)⁴, but has a lusty competitor in *vermo(u)lissure*, of which Godefroy gives numerous examples from 1547 onwards.

To sum up, we find in the sixteenth century the following forms: infinitive, *se vermouler*, *vermouli*r, *se vermouli*r; participles, *vermoulé*, *vermouli*, *vermoulu*; adjectives, *vermoulé*, *vermo(u)lu*; nouns, *vermoulu* and *vermo(u)lissure*. Ultimately, in the seventeenth century, the forms in 'i': *vermouli*r, *vermouli*, *vermoulissure*, die out, and we are left with the modern trio, *se vermouler*, *vermoulu*, *vermoulu*re, which is consecrated by the 1762 edition of the Academy's dictionary.

It appears strange, if *vermoulu* is really composed of *ver* and *moulu*, participle of *moudre*, that in the sixteenth century, when the sense of the etymology of words is so strong, we should find such a number of forms where, formally, the association of the word and its kindred with the verb *moudre* is, to say the least, remote. The reason will become apparent, if we glance at a couple of examples given by Godefroy, s.v. *Vermolissure*: '(1) Où les choses sont corrompues à cause de la chaleur, et la putrefaction est dite *vermoulissure* (1556); (2) *Vermiculatio*, *vermolissure*, quand les vers s'engendrent es fruits ou arbres et les mangent (1584).' It is clear from these examples that the term is of very wide application, that it can be used of putrefaction generally, and in refer-

¹ The *Dict. Gén.* puts the first appearance of the form much later.

² Accompanied by the remark 'peu usité' in the 1771 edition.

³ Cf. Fort *vermoulu*, cariosus, in the *Dict. Franç.-Lat.* (1549).

⁴ 'Tout ainsi que la *vermoulu*re s'engendre dans le bois.'

ence to things other than wood¹. R. Estienne's 'Cariem trahere, *se vermouler* et pourrir de vieillesse' and 'Cariosus, fort *vermoulu*, pourri et corrompu' confirm this, and we make bold to conclude that, whatever the origin of the various words may prove to be, the verbal element in them is negligible, and that they have a meaning half-way between the meanings conveyed by the modern adjectives *véreux* on the one hand and *pourri* on the other; the idea of 'worms' and that of 'rotteness' are both distinguishable; the idea of 'milling' or 'grinding' appears to be entirely absent. That is to say, the verbal content is scarcely greater than in such words as O.F. *vermer*: 'et convanra vo char anientir et *vermer*'; mod. dial. *sé vè mè* (v. Godef.), 'se pourrir, se détériorer'; O.F. *verminer*: 'la pume (pomme) qui...par dedens *vermine*'; O.F. *vermir*: 'le velin (venin) qui estoit en la plaie luy *vermissoit* tout le corps²'; Walloon (Liégeois) *si viemi*, 'se vermouler,' in Grandgagnage; late O.F. *vermenir*: 'ses dens *vermenissent* moult durement'; late O.F. and mod. dial. *verir*, 'pourrir³, se gâter.'

We thus begin to have doubts about the verbal quality of the second portion of *vermoulu* and its fellows. Our doubts are further strengthened if we turn to the patois. Unfortunately, there is no map 'Vermoulu' in the *Atlas Linguistique de la France*: we must therefore content ourselves with the somewhat fragmentary evidence to be gleaned from the various patois or dialect dictionaries. After consulting a great number of these, we are led to draw the following important conclusions:

1. It is a most frequent occurrence for a patois to content itself with one word for the French pair *véreux* and *vermoulu* and to make no distinction between the ideas 'wormy' and 'worm-eaten.'

2. Irrespective of the use of the standard French *vermoulu*, which is naturally fairly widespread⁴, and apart also from simple equivalents like *pourri* or *bouta* (? 'bouté, piqué') given for *vermoulu* in Bloch's *Lexique Français-Patois des Vosges Méridionales*, the derivatives used to express the idea of 'worm-eaten' (or 'wormy') are either (a) adjectives formed of a word for 'worm' or 'grub' plus an adjectival suffix, or (b) participles with the barest element of verbal content, viz., that con-

¹ Most of Godefroy's examples refer to wood or trees.

² Cf. *vermissure* in Godefroy; used (1) of plants: 'plein de *vermissure*'; (2) of bones: 'se reduysent en pouldre et *vermissure*'; G. translates by 'vermoulure.' Both examples are dated 1549.

³ The influence of *varius* is not to be ruled out of this word; cf. Fr. *altérer*.

⁴ Proofs that, although widespread, *vermoulu* is not a popular form are not lacking; thus, at point 284 of the *Atlas*, where *myé a ver* (mangé aux vers) is the normal form, we are told that *vermoulu* is also known, whereas, at 285 *mejé a ver* alone is found. At point 986, *vermoulu* is the name given to the 'glow-worm'!

tained in the ending of the past participle of the first conjugation; no more, for example, than in words like *rouillé* or *taché*.

Witness the following examples:

I. Adjectives.

Type 1, **Vermosus*: *vyelv* (< *vye* 'ver' + analogical cons. + -osum) 'vermoulu'; *vyatv* (< *vya* 'ver') 'vermoulu' and 'véreux'; *vetv*, f. *vyetvz* (< *vye* 'ver') 'vermoulu' and 'véreux'¹.

Type 2, *Verminosus*: *vermineux* 'rempli de vers, vermoulu' (Normandy²); *vermenou* 'véreux, se dit surtout des fruits' (Grenoble³); cf. O.F. *vermenos* 'piqué par des vers' (Godefroy⁴); cf. also Provençal *vermenous* etc., Gascon *bermiours* 'véreux, vermineux, vermoulu' (Mistral), and Rumanian *viernános* 'véreux, vermoulu' (Damé).

Type 3, *Vermiculosus*: Walloon *viernoyeu* 'vermoulu' (Remacle)⁵, *vermoieus* 'piqué des vers' (Grandgagnage)⁶; *vermeyous* 'véreux' (Moselle⁷); cf. O.F. (1464, Godef.) *vermieux* 'vermoulu,' doubtless for **vermilleus*⁸ < O.F. *vermil* 'vermoulure': *le vermil* au bois (Godef. and Ste.-Palaye).

II. Participial Forms.

Type 1, **Vermatus*: no French patois examples are forthcoming; but compare, for the Provençal area, *vearpata-àia* 'vermoulu' (Basses-Alpes) (cf. *vearp* 'ver de terre')⁹; *se verpa* 'se vermouler' (Mistral); cf. also O.F. *vermer* (of the flesh) in Godefroy.

Type 2, *Verminatus*: again we have no clear French examples meaning 'vermoulu,' like Mistral's *vermena*, -at, -ado 'vermoulu' (cf. *vermenaduro* 'vermoulure') and *se vermena* 'se vermouler'; but cf. O.F. *verminé* 'infecté de vers'; Bournois (Doubs)¹⁰ *vormuna*, -e 'miné par la vermine'; and Norman *verminer* 'produire de la vermine'¹¹, *vermineux* 'miné par

¹ Bloch, *Lexique*; cf. *ibid.* *vyefu*, *vyetlu* (< *vye*) 'véreux'; and *viellu*, -uz, *viernu*, -uz, 'véreux,' in Horning, *Gloss. der rom. Mundarten* (Vosges).

² Moisy, *Dict. du patois normand*.

³ A. Ravannat, *Dict. du patois des environs de Grenoble*.

⁴ Godefroy's examples refer chiefly to fruit, but also to seeds, to garments, and to an old man: 'Vieillard caduc et *vermeneux*, Vieillard à demi charongneux' (Ronsard).

⁵ *Dict. Wallon-Français* (for the phonetic development, cf. Walloon *solo* < *soliculum*). Remacle's article is significant and worth quoting: '*Viernoyeu*, t. passif et subs. *Vermoulu*, ce qui est percé, piqué des vers, il se dit substantivement de celui qui a une figure de chafouin, qui est maigre, pâle, qui paraît être rongé de vers à l'intérieur.' One has met with a similar use of 'wormy' colloquially in English.

⁶ *Dict. de la Langue wallonne*.

⁷ Zeligzon, *Dict. des patois rom. de la Moselle*.

⁸ According to Nyrop, *Gram. Hist.*, I, p. 283, the orthographical equivalence of -ille and -ie (cf. *bastille*, *souquenille*, *fourmiller* for *bastie*, etc.) is attested as early as the sixteenth century. It is really a good deal earlier, for we find the spelling *roillier* for *roier* 'wheelwright' as early as 1431, v. Godefroy.

⁹ Arnaud et Morin, *Langue de la vallée de Barcelonnette*.

¹⁰ Roussey, *Glossaire du parler de Bournois*.

¹¹ Dubois et Travers, *Glossaire des patois normands*.

les vers¹, vermoulu.' We note also that Rolland, *Faune populaire*, III, p. 343, gives *verminia* as a name for the death-watch insect (Bussy-le-Grand, Côte d'Or).

Type 3, **Vermicellatus*: *vermesla* and numerous phonetic variants, 'vermoulu' (Vosges²); *varmoeslé*, -è 'vermoulu' (Haute-Saône³); *vvermesla* 'vermoulu' (Doubs⁴); cf. for the meaning, *varmeuchelai* 'attaqué par les vers (fruits, légumes)' (Vosges⁵).

It is not necessary to multiply other examples of these participial formations unconnected with *vermis*; let us note, however, the very widespread *cossoné* 'vermoulu' (< *cosson*), given in the Supplement to the *Atlas Linguistique* at points 435, 722, 741, 743, 744 etc. (cf. Palissy⁶: '...et engendrera quelques *cossons* ou vermine qui quelque temps apres gasteront le bois'), and *artisonné* (< *artison*; cf. Amyot⁷: '...les artisons s'engendrent et se mettent principalement es bois tendres et doux'), which is given a place in Littré. The process of formation by means of *-atus* is always imminent⁸, and a participle with this ending does not necessarily presuppose a corresponding infinitive⁹, although an infinitive (e.g. O.F. *vermer*) would generally imply the existence of a corresponding participial adjective¹⁰.

Against this mass of varied yet concurring words—concurring in the general equivalence of 'wormy' and 'worm-eaten,' and in the absence of any significant verbal element in the derivative forms, stands in sharp contrast the word *vermoulu*, O.F. *vermolu*: 'moulu par les vers,' strange in its composition, unique in its content.

It is time to bring into the picture another word, deliberately held in reserve, which will perhaps bring harmony into the whole. In an unpublished poem entitled '*Vers de la Mort*' (not Helinand's) we find the following passage, quoted in part by Godefroy¹¹:

Bion dëust cascun sovenir,
Por mius ses pecies espenir,
Que trop couste a bien retenir
Maisons a tous le[s] *vermelue*;
Mais nus ne veut tex devenir,
Ains emprent fais a soustenir
Dont ame et cors ensamble tue.

¹ We see here, and in the example from Roussey, a 'Ménagean' etymology, like that of *vermoulu* = 'moulu par les vers,' in process of germination.

² Bloch, *Lexique*.

³ Juret, *Glossaire du patois de Pierrecourt*.

⁴ Boillot, *Patois de la Grande Combe*.

⁵ Vautherin, *Glossaire du patois de Châtenois*.

⁶ Cit. Littré.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Cf. Provençal *chirounat*, *-ado* (< *chiroun* 'ciron') 'vermoulu,' 'pourri' (Mistral); Italian *tarlato* (< *tarlo*) 'worm-eaten'; Latin *vermiculatus* (< *vermiculus*).

⁹ For example, there is, as far as I am aware, no *tlarlare* or *tlarlarsi* corresponding to Italian *tarlato*.

¹⁰ Portuguese, however, seems to use *carunchar* (< *carunchu*) and *carunchoso*.

¹¹ *Complément*, s.v. Vermoulu.

What is *vermelu*? The meaning is clear: it is identical with that of its modern equivalent, *vermoulu*; but what of its form, which I have personally verified in the manuscript (Bibliothèque Nationale, Français 375, fol. 340 v^o)?

Readers of Old French are familiar with the richness and variety which characterised the old language, as compared with the modern. Especially is this the case in the use of suffixes for derivation, so that frequently from the same root-word we find derivatives apparently synonymous but formed with different suffixes. Consider the following examples:

Dent > *dentous*, *dentu*, 'long-toothed' or 'many-toothed.'

Mamelle > *mamelous*, *mamelu*, 'big-breasted.'

Chevel > *chevelos*, *chevelu*, 'hairy' or 'long-haired.'

Cors > *corsieus*, *corsu*, 'corpulent.'

Raim > *rameux*, *ramu*, 'thick-branched.'

Veine > *veineux*, *veinu*, 'many-veined.'

Poil > *poileux*, *poilu*, 'hairy.'

It will be readily agreed that a pair like O.F. *vermelos* and O.F. *vermelu* would not be out of place in such a series. In short, *vermelu* is composed of a diminutive of *vermis* plus the suffix *-utus*, just as O.F. *vermelos*, Haute-Maine *vermeleux*¹, and probably, Poitevin *vermelot*, *-otte*², where there has been a change of suffix³, are composed of the same diminutive plus *-osus*. *Vermelu* is, therefore, a perfectly normal form, as normal and regular beside its partner *vermelos* as *chevelu* beside *chevelos*. Moreover, it is perfectly normal in its meaning, and as irreproachable as a conveyer of the idea 'worm-eaten' as any of the numerous adjectives derived from *vermis* which we have tabulated above. Lastly, it is as old as Beaumanoir's *vermolu*, or even older; for the latter composed his *Coutumes* between the years 1280 and 1283, whereas the manuscript which gives us the form *vermelu* is dated 1288, so that the *Vers de la Mort*, only one among many texts contained in the manuscript, can be safely dated a good deal earlier.

What then of the abnormal *vermolu*: 'moulu par les vers,' which is beginning to look more and more a monster? It only remains a monster so long as it continues to be a verb and to mean 'moulu par les vers'; just as O.F. and mod. dial.⁴ *verminé* would be a monster if explained as

¹ Vide Godefroy, s.v. *Vermelos*.

² Rousseau, *Glossaire poitevin*: *Vermelot*, *-otte*, 'gâté par les vers, pourri.'

³ In this dialect the suffix *-ot* seems to alternate with *-oux* (*-eux*); cf. the adj. *cassour*, *cassot* in the same glossary.

⁴ Doubs, v. *supra*, p. 402.

being 'miné par les vers¹.' It becomes normal if, like *vermelu*, it is an adjective. Not only is it an adjective, it is *vermelu* itself in another guise.

The Latin diminutive of *vermis* is *vermiculus*, which, although it has disappeared in this function from standard French², survives in Sarthe *vermeil* 'vermisseau,' and Provençal *vermeu* 'vermisseau' and 'kermès' (Mistral). Chronologically, two explanations of the form *vermelu* are possible. (1) It may be derived from a diminutive **vermel*³. If so, the latter is clearly not a regular development from *vermiculum*, but its existence might be safely deduced from the presence of words like the adjective *vermelos* and the double diminutive *vermelet*, both found in Old French. In that case, **vermel* is either a French creation and another of the numerous diminutives of *ver* that the language has coined (*vermet*, *veret*, *verin*, *verot*, *verchon*, *versonchel*, etc.) or it is the Latin diminutive *vermiculum*, irregularly developed because of some disturbing factor⁴. Or (2) it may represent an earlier **vermeillu*, with a depalatalising of the 'l' again due to some disturbing influence. Walloon *viernoyeu* (i.e. **vermeilleux*), accompanied as it is by O.F. and mod. dial. *vermeleux*, seems to guide us with assurance to this second alternative.

In both cases, it will be seen, we are obliged to postulate some disturbing element. The latter is not far to seek: it is the restriction of meaning which befell Latin *vermiculum* > *vermeil*, when it came to be used no longer as a diminutive of *vermis*, but as a term to designate the kermes insect and the dye produced therefrom. Further consequences of this disturbance, without which the problem of *vermoulu* would never have arisen, will be set forth below, when we attempt an explanation of *vermouler* and *vermoullir*. Let us first finish with *vermelu* and *vermo(u)lu*. *Vermelu* is **vermeillu* depalatalised in order to escape from *vermeil* 'red,' a depalatalisation helped by adjectives such as *mamelu* and *chevelu*, and by the co-existence of alternative verb-forms such as *bolir* and *bowillir*, *rouler* and *rouiller*. *Vermolu* is either a *vermelu* modified to provide a further escape from *vermeil*, under association with the adjective *mol*, or with the verb *moliner* 'to reduce to powder⁵,' or else, and we lean

¹ See p. 403, n. 1.

² Littré has a word *vermeil* 'lieu où se trouvent des vers': 'mener la volaille au vermeil,' but this is probably a post-verbal from the verb *vermeiller*, *vermiller*, for which v. *infra*.

³ Cf. *vereil*, *verel*, *veroil*, all from *veru*.

⁴ Cf. Picard *vermeau* 'vermisseau, larve du hanneton' (Corblet).

⁵ Cf. *bois mouliné*, *cire moulinée*, in Littré. The softness of worm-eaten wood and the flour-like powder cast out by the borers are familiar to everyone. Under this hypothesis the equation *Vermoulu* = 'moulu par les vers' is of the nature of one of Gillieron's 'Ety-mologies II.' The form *viernolu*, found in Walloon side by side with the more popular *viernoyeu*, and doubtless of literary origin, has indeed brought into being an equivalent of a **vermoudre*, viz. Namurois *si viernodr* (Grandgagnage), the only example of such a formation I have discovered.

strongly to this explanation, it is a **vermoillu* (dialect form) which has undergone depalatalisation for the same reasons and under the same associations, and which therefore fulfils a similar function in the language as the 'irregular' forms *moins*, *foin*, *l'avoine* which oust the phonetically unfortunate 'regular' forms [mẽ, fẽ, lavɛ:n] and eliminate the numerous homonymic clashes that their retention would have entailed.

As for the verbs *vermouler* and *vermo(u)lir*, although they appear for the first time in texts of the sixteenth century, and then chiefly, it would seem, in dictionaries, we are convinced that they are genuine ancient words. To express in one verb the idea 'to become worm-eaten' either the conjugation in *-er* or that in *-ir* would serve, with or without the reflexive¹, though the reflexive would be more usual with the first conjugation verb. In other words, a **vermeillier* from Latin *vermiculari* (or from Fr. *vermeil* + *-are*) and a **vermeillir* from Fr. *vermeil* are equally satisfactory for the purpose; the former standing in relation to *vermeil* as O.F. *vermer* to *verm*, or *verminer* to *vermine*, the latter as *vermir* and *vermenir* to the same nouns. Now it will be noted that *vermo(u)ler* and *vermo(u)lir*, compared respectively with the asterisked forms **vermeillier* and **vermeillir*, show exactly the same differences, namely 'o' for 'e' as the middle vowel and a depalatalised 'l.' But the forms **vermeiller* and **vermeillir*, though asterisked, are scarcely hypothetical: **vermeiller* represents faithfully Latin *vermiculari* 'to become worm-eaten,' and **vermeillir* has its equivalent in modern Walloon *si vermoî* 'se vermouler' (Grandgagnage). The only hindrance to our identifying the words *vermouler* and *vermouler* with **vermeiller* and **vermeillir* is therefore a phonological one. It can be overcome if we attach due importance to the existence of rival meanings of *vermeil*, an older, that of 'little worm,' a younger, that of 'kermes' and later 'red,' and consider the linguistic struggle which this rivalry set in motion.

Etymologically, O.F. *vermeillier* can have three meanings: (1) 'to hunt for worms' (cf. Lat. *piscare* < *piscis*), (2) 'to become worm-eaten,' (3) 'to redden.' O.F. *vermeillir* can have two: (1) 'to become worm-eaten,' (2) 'to redden.' This, again, is no hypothetical reconstruction; *vermeillier* 'to worm' is found in O.F. as *vermeillier*, *vermillier*, with a third form represented by the noun *vermulage* or *vermullage*, and is used of pigs and wild boar burrowing for worms; *vermeillier* 'to become worm-eaten' is given us by the Latin *vermiculari* (cf. *vermer* and *verminer*); *vermeillier* 'to redden' is a common Old French word, with alternative forms *vermillier* and *vermollier*. Similarly, *vermeillir* 'to become worm-eaten,'

¹ Cf. *rouiller* and *se rouiller*, *durcir* and *se durcir*.

though not attested in Old French, survives in Walloon *vermoîi* (cf. *vermir* and *vermenir*), and *vermeillir* 'to redden,' though rarer, apparently, than the corresponding *vermeillier*, is found in the texts with alternative forms *vermillir* and *vermoillir*.

We have clearly here a source of confusion, and the elements of a linguistic conflict which, though impossible, perhaps, to disentangle, save in its most salient stages, is none the less evident and real¹. The strongest of the combatants are the verbs backed up by *vermeil* 'red.' When once this equivalence had come about, the defeat of the derivatives of *vermeil* 'little worm' was as good as certain. The suffix *-iculum* > *-eil* can scarcely be said to survive in French as a diminutive suffix, and thus *vermeil* can readily break away from its association with *vermis*, for the language has ample resources wherewith to fill any gap it may leave: witness the diminutives *vermet*, *veret*, *verin*, *verot*, *verchon*, *versonchel*, etc. *Vermeil* 'red' therefore, thrives and prospers, and begets a numerous progeny of derivatives whereas the offspring of *vermeil* 'little worm' are obliged to resort to subterfuge to survive².

In a conflict of this nature it is no uncommon thing for the victor himself to show distinct traces of the fray. The verb *donner*, for example, shows signs of its struggle with a pre-literary *dare* in the numerous forms of its present subjunctive in Old French: *done*, *donge*, *doigne*, *doinsse*, the last two forms being evident traces of a *dare* endeavouring to survive by taking on forms similar to those of its fellow in deficiency, *stare*. So with *vermeillier* 'to redden.' In the 'Chanson de Geste' *Gaydon* (*Anciens Poètes de la France* edition), we find two examples of the word:

Dou sanc des cors est li pres *vermoilliez* (l. 1677);

Li corps descent sor l'escu *vermoillie* (l. 1685).

The edition is based upon the MS. Français 860 which shows practically no dialect features. After examining all the 'laisses' assonancing in the diphthong *ie*, which is the readiest method of detecting words of like formation, we discover no other example of a similar treatment of the group *e + l* 'mouillé'; there are several examples of *conseillier* (one *consillier*), many examples of *appareillier* (*-iez*), *merveillier*, and one example of *oreillier*. *Vermoillier* is the only word in which the group appears with a dialect treatment³. This can be no mere coincidence. It is a tangible sign of the conflict set forth above, marked in this case

¹ What, for example, is to be understood, during the period of conflict, by the words: *ces pommes commencent à vermeiller*? Are they getting red or rotten?

² The O.F. adj. *vermeillet* is interesting in this respect. The older forms given by Godefroy hesitate between *-eill-*, *-ill-*, and *-oill-*; the later forms all have *-eill-*.

³ In *Floevent* (*Anc. Poètes* edition) where the MS. is definitely south-eastern, we find *vermoilit* (l. 2021) but also *consoilier* and *melvoiliez* (*sic*) for *merveilliez*.

by a temporary or local retreat of *vermeillier* 'to redden' into a dialect form¹.

This transitory refuge of *vermeillier* 'to redden' is a permanency in the case of the other two combatants. *Vermeillier* 'to catch worms' finds escape in the dialect form *vermiller*, the modern term of venery, which is to be contrasted with the word *herbeiller*, also used of the wild boar, which, having undergone no such trials, preserves its perfectly regular form.

Vermeillier 'to become worm-eaten' is left with the other dialect form as its retreat, *vermoillier*, a form which is in unfortunate association with *moillier*, *mouiller*: 'ce bois est sujet à se vermouiller'! There remained the final device of depalatalisation of the 'l,' made possible by the alternation of forms like *bouillir* and *bo(u)lir*, *rouiller* and *rouler*². Hence the sixteenth-century and modern form of the word (*se*) *vermouler*, representing an earlier **vermoler*³.

The fate of *vermeillir*, 'to become worm-eaten,' was similar. After taking refuge in the dialect form *vermoillir* (Walloon *vermoîr*), it, too, underwent depalatalisation, like its rival and associate, *vermeillier*. It could only gain by the change to *vermolir*, which brought it, so to speak, into the orbit of the verb *mol(l)ir* 'to soften.'

To sum up, O.F. *vermolu*, like O.F. *vermelu*, its fellow and synonym, is an adjective derived from *vermeil* < *vermiculum* by means of the suffix -u. Both *vermolu* and *vermelu* show an irregular treatment of the vowel. Sixteenth-century (*se*) *vermouler* and sixteenth-century (*se*) *vermouler* represent earlier **vermoillier* and **vermoillir*, irregular (dialect) derivatives of *vermiculum*. The irregularity in all cases can be accounted for by the narrowing down of the meaning of *vermiculum* from 'little worm' to 'kermes' and 'red.' *Vermo(u)lure*⁴ is derived from *vermo(u)ler*, *vermo(u)lissure* from *vermo(u)lir*. Any possible contact that these words may have with *moudre* 'to mill' can only be by an association of ideas due to an accident of form, similar to that we have discovered more ephemerally in *verminatum* > *verminé* = 'miné par les vers.'

(To be continued.)

JOHN ORR.

MANCHESTER.

¹ It is noteworthy too that *vermeiller's* triumph was comparatively short-lived. For reasons which we need not at present discuss, it gives way about the sixteenth century to *vermeillonner*, mod. *vermilloner*, a homonym, by the way, of a venery term used of badgers.

² *Rouiller*, depalatalised to *rouler* escapes from *rouille*.

³ Cf. O.F. *vermoleure* 'vermoulure.'

⁴ Cf. *vermeilleure* (one example in Godefroy, 1554) from *vermeiller* 'to redden.'

THE FIFTH BOOK OF RABELAIS

HALF of M. Sainéan's recent volume, *Problèmes littéraires du seizième siècle* (Boccard, 1927), deals with *Le moyen de parvenir*, a few pages with the authenticity of *Les joyeux devis*, and the rest with Rabelais's Fifth Book. This last is a welcome contribution to the solution of a much-debated question. M. Sainéan rightly rejects the irresponsible and unsupported statements made at the beginning of the seventeenth century (both in 1604) by Antoine Du Verdier, the bibliographer, and Louis Guyon, a physician. He follows Le Duchat in pointing out that Du Verdier has confused the *Isle sonante* with *Fanfreluche et Gaudichon*, a pastiche of Rabelais by Guillaume Des Autels, and he says that no one but a physician could have given the technical details about dropsy and consumption in c. xx¹ (as a matter of fact, it is not clear whether Guyon is referring to the complete book or only to the *Isle sonante*). He is equally right in disregarding the impressionist opinions of modern critics, whether they are in favour of the authenticity of the Fifth Book, like Paul Lacroix, or against it like Paulin Paris, Burgaud Desmarets, and Brunetière. Nor does he attach any weight to the confident verdict of Birch-Hirschfeld, founded partly upon 'futile' statistical details. Marty-Laveaux took a middle course and he gave his opinion merely as a conjecture. It was that Rabelais left behind him several fragments, of which some were destined for earlier books but were suppressed as dangerous, while others were still in the rough, waiting to be 'licked into shape,' and that with the help of these 'a most unworthy imitator' composed the Fifth Book.

For M. Sainéan the period of scientific research into the question begins in 1905 with the admirable reprint of the *Isle sonante* by M. Abel Lefranc and M. Jacques Boulenger. In the same year M. Lefranc published *Les Navigations de Panurge*, in which, without entering into a regular discussion on the authenticity of the Fifth Book, he declared that 'several years of study on its text had brought him to the conviction that, except for the evident interpolation of a certain number of chapters, certain modifications and additions of details, and some alterations in the text made by the editor, the book was largely (pour une part assez notable) the work of Rabelais himself.' This cautious

¹ I follow Marty-Laveaux's reckoning of the chapters, that is to say, excluding the *Isle des Apedefes*. M. Sainéan includes it.

but deliberate opinion made considerable impression on serious students of Rabelais, and not a few who had been hitherto doubters or even opponents were converted by M. Lefranc's learned and persuasive advocacy.

• With the help of the reprint of the *Isle sonante* and of M. Boulenger's excellent introduction I carefully analysed in this *Review* (1906-7) the earlier chapters of the Fifth Book and I came to the conclusion, which is practically that of M. Boulenger, that it was printed from a copy, carelessly punctuated and badly written, of Rabelais's manuscript, and that it was not revised either by the person who put it in the hands of the printer or by any editor. Fifteen years later I carried on the analysis for the rest of the book, with the result that I came to the final conclusion that the whole is in the main Rabelais's work, but that in several chapters there are evident interpolations¹. Previous to this, W. F. Smith, who in his knowledge of Rabelais was second to none, had expressed practically the same opinion in *Rabelais in his Writings*².

Thus there came about at this time a general agreement among the majority of serious students of Rabelais in favour of the authenticity of the Fifth Book. But in 1923 M. Pierre Villey poured a cold douche of disbelief on our results. In eight pages of *Les grands écrivains du xvi^e siècle*, I. *Rabelais et Marot*, he subjects them to a rapid criticism³.

He begins by repeating the statements of Du Verdier—he will not hear of Duchat's objection—and Louis Guyon, and by declaring that their categorical affirmations, combined with strong presumptions against the authenticity of the book, throw the burden of the proof upon those who defend it. Then he examines what he calls our principal argument, namely, the extreme incorrectness of the printing, which points to the absence of any supervision on the part of the author. To argue from this that the author was dead is, he says, an enormous step (*un abîme*). The printing may have been done without the author, or even in spite of him. In this year, 1562, when civil war had just broken out, the author may have thought it prudent to keep himself in the background. Or he may have been ill, or he may have been dead. All quite possible hypotheses. But none of them explains why a person who had been at the pains to manufacture an imitation of Rabelais should (1) have left

¹ *Studies in the French Renaissance*, Cambridge, 1922. M. Sainéan makes me say that 'several chapters are interpolations,' which is a very different thing. I believe that in every chapter there is something of Rabelais.

² Cambridge, 1918. In *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, cxxxiii (1915), there is a good *résumé* of the state of the problem by P. Hofer, but he adds nothing new.

³ In *Bibliothèque littéraire de la Renaissance*, Paris, Champion, 1923.

passages in his manuscript which make no sense, (2) have left unaltered the abbreviations 'pro. et Ther' (*sic*) for 'profanes et theomaches' (c. xi), (3) have written 'Ayant autresfois eu procuration la laissames,' which implies that the travellers were sailing for the second time by the Island of Procuration inhabited by the Chiquanous.

Further, M. Villey seems to be oblivious of the fact that the *Isle sonante* and the rest of the Fifth Book stand on a perfectly different footing as regards the textual evidence. The text of the *Isle sonante* forces upon us, in my opinion, the conclusion that with the possible exception of the *début*, 'Cestuy jour...equinoctial,' which is almost identical with the opening words of c. ii of the incomplete Fourth Book of 1548¹, it is free from interpolations. On the other hand there are obvious interpolations in the rest of the book. Apart from the anachronistic mention of Scaliger in c. xviii, upon which some critics have almost entirely relied as fatal to the authenticity of the book, there are probably other passages in the same chapter and also passages in cc. xx, xxi, xxvi-xxviii which have been interpolated by the editor. For this part of the book was certainly 'edited' and not merely handed over to the printer as it was found. His actual procedure can only be conjectured. But apparently he made a copy of all Rabelais's manuscripts, including those which had been already printed in the *Isle sonante*, with the omission of the *Island of the Apedesties*². From this copy the text of 1564 was printed at Lyons, and the proofs were read and corrected by a fresh editor. At the end of the volume appeared the well-known quatrain beginning, *Rabelais est il mort?* and signed *Nature quite*, which Le Duchat conjectured to be an anagram of Jean Turquet. This conjecture has been recently confirmed by M. Dupont who found at the head of an edition (1564) of the *Maison rustique* of Charles Estienne two sonnets and a quatrain addressed to the editor Jean Liébault by Jean de Mayerne surnommé Turquet, *médecin*, and signed *Nature quite* (*sic*)³. M. Dupont conjectures that these verses first appeared in an edition (unknown) of the *Maison rustique*—there were several—published soon after 1564, the date of the publication of

¹ Either the copyist may have borrowed the passage (taking it either direct from the text of 1548 or combining two passages from that of 1552), or Rabelais may have inadvertently repeated himself. M. Sainéan is in favour of the second variation of the former alternative.

² The MS. of the Bibliothèque Nationale is a late sixteenth-century copy made by an honest but ignorant and unintelligent scribe.

³ The well-known physician of James I and Charles I, Theodore Turquet de Mayerne (1573-1655), was the eldest son of Louis Turquet de Mayerne (1550-1618), who wrote a history of Spain. Paul Lacroix says that the latter was the son of Jean, but there is nothing to confirm this.

the Fifth Book. He sees in this a testimony to the good faith of Jean Turquet in the matter of the Fifth Book¹. It certainly shows that he believed the book to be in the main a genuine work of Rabelais. He may, however, have been deceived, and as the partisans of the book's authenticity admit that it contains interpolations, they are bound to support their arguments by an appeal to internal evidence. This evidence consists of the presence of certain features which are generally regarded as characteristic of Rabelais's acknowledged work. I have already called attention to most of these², but I am glad to have my position strengthened by M. Sainéan's independent and in some cases supplementary observations. The features in question are as follows:

1. *References to Touraine and especially to Chinon.*

As M. Sainéan says, they are scattered about from the beginning to the end of the Voyage. The most notable instance in the Fifth Book is the reference to Chinon in c. xxxiv as 'la première ville du monde,' and the explanation that it was originally called Caynon after Cain, and that Cain is the first person recorded in the Scriptures as the builder of a city. Surely no one but Rabelais would have thought of this or spoken of Chinon as the model which all other founders imitated when they gave their name to cities.

2. *Interest in geographical discovery.*

This is especially noticeable in cc. xxix and xxx (The country of Satin), but it also appears in the reference to Robert vb (W)allbrun = Roberval in c. iii.

3. *Knowledge of zoology.*

This is shown, as M. Sainéan points out, by the reference in c. xxix to the rare animals which the writer had seen or read about, such as the rhinoceros of Hans Kleberger of Lyons or the chameleon of the physician, Charles Marais, also of Lyons. As M. Sainéan, who speaks from expert knowledge³, says, 'No one, except Rabelais, possessed at this date so sure and extensive a knowledge of natural history.' The writer also shows a considerable knowledge of botany.

4. *Great learning (especially a knowledge of Hebrew and Greek).*

Here M. Sainéan, whose valuable articles on Rabelais's vocabulary have been collected in two volumes⁴, is very instructive. 'This re-

¹ *Rev. du XVI^e siècle*, xii (1925), pp. 403 ff.

² See *Studies in the French Renaissance*, pp. 96, 99, 118.

³ *L'Histoire naturelle et les branches connexes dans l'œuvre de Rabelais*, 1920.

⁴ *La Langue de Rabelais*, 2 vols., 1922-1923.

course to Hebrew,' he says, 'is absolutely unique in the literature of the sixteenth century.' Rabelais, he adds, has used it in the Second Book for one of the languages employed by Panurge, in the Fourth Book for the allegorical names of some of the countries visited on the Voyage, and here in the Fifth Book for the officers of Queen Entéléchie's household and for the abstractions which formed her habitual diet (c. xix). The author's knowledge of Greek, which is far deeper, is shown by his constant employment of Greek terms, as in the earlier books, and by an abundant use of French words formed from Greek and other Hellenisms (see pp. 58-63).

5. *The use made of certain books and authors.*

(a) *Le Disciple de Pantagruel*¹. In his former books Rabelais made considerable use of this work, which appeared in 1538. He got from it the idea of visiting the country of Lanternois and the Oracle of the Bottle (III, xlvi), and he borrowed from it rather extensively for the death of Bringuénarilles (IV, xvii) and the *Isle Farouche* inhabited by the *Andouilles* (IV, xxxv, xlii). The Fifth Book owes to it the idea of the Island of Tools, and the list of weapons in that chapter is expanded from the list in *Le Disciple*². The only other textual borrowing from it is a chapter in the MS. (omitted in the printed text) entitled 'Comment furent les Dames Lanternes servies à soupper.' After a dull enumeration of dishes, imitated from an analogous list in c. xiv of *Le Disciple*, it describes how they dance after supper and gives a long list of 175 different dances and airs, all of which, with three additional ones, are to be found in c. xv of *Le Disciple*.

(b) *The Hypnerotomachia* or *Songe de Poliphile*. The direct borrowings from this work are very considerable. The most important are the game of chess (cc. xxiii and xxiv), the description of the temple (cc. xxxvi, xxxvii, xl, xli, part of xliii), and certain details in cc. xxxviii and xxxix. But there are others in cc. v and xv, and there are signs of inspiration in cc. xix and xxix. M. Sainéan further points out that the allegory and symbolism of Colonna's book have had a great influence on the whole account of the Voyage, and that its diction has left frequent traces on the language of Queen Entéléchie. M. Villey puts aside this work, (1) because Rabelais, though he mentions it in *Gargantua*, does not borrow anything from it, (2) because the literal transcripts in the Fifth Book are quite contrary to Rabelais's practice and therefore

¹ See Sainéan, pp. 17-19.

² The *Isle sonante* adds five weapons to the seven enumerated in *Le Disciple*.

evidence of its unauthenticity¹. In his first objection M. Villey is mistaken. The name of Thélème for Rabelais's famous abbey is probably taken from the nymph Thélémia in the *Hypnerotomachia*. The description of the fountain at the beginning of c. lv and of the dresses in c. lvi, and more doubtfully the inscription, 'Fay ce que voudras,' owe something to the same source. There are traces of it also in the Fourth Book, in the description of the *Isle des Macréons* (c. xxv)² and in the account of the dinner given by Bishop Homenaz (c. li)³. M. Sainéan has an answer to M. Villey's second objection; he regards the literal transcripts as destined to be recast and revised before finding a place in the definitive text. This is a most reasonable suggestion and may be right. But I am doubtful. The game of chess, which is considerably amplified, is careful and finished work, and I should put in the same category the last fifteen chapters (xxxiii–xlvi) with the single exception of c. xxxiv. I do not, however, regard this as evidence of an imitator's presence.

(c) *Erasmus and Budé*. As every student of Rabelais knows, he had a profound admiration for Erasmus, and the passages in the first four books borrowed from or inspired by him are very numerous⁴. They are equally numerous in the Fifth Book, especially in cc. viii, xxi, and xxxii. Rabelais's indebtedness to Budé, both personal and literary, is equally well known; in the Fifth Book his *De Asse* and his *Annotaciones in Pandectas* are laid under contribution.

(d) *Coelius Rhodiginus* and *Pierre Gilles* were two contemporary humanists of whom Rabelais made liberal use. Rhodiginus's *Antiquae Lectiones* is the source of passages in cc. xxv (Island of Odes), xxix (Country of Satin) and xlvii of the Fifth Book, while Pierre Gilles's Latin translation of *Ælian*, to which is appended a work of his own on the Latin and French names of fishes (Lyons, Gryphius, 1533), has been drawn upon for the list of animals in v, xxix⁵.

(e) *Plutarch, Lucian, Ælian, Pliny, Servius*. The author of the Fifth Book had evidently read widely in Greek and Latin authors, and among his favourite sources of information are the five mentioned above. They happen also to be among those to whom Rabelais, as we know from the preceding books, frequently resorted.

¹ In his second objection he is following H. K. Söltoft-Jensen in *Rev. d'hist. litt.*, III (1896), pp. 608–612.

² See the reference in the *Briefve declaration*.

³ The fullest account of Rabelais's debt to Colonna's book will be found in L. Thuasne, *Études sur Rabelais*, 1904, pp. 267–314. See also W. F. Smith in *The Modern Quarterly of Language and Literature* for April 1899, pp. 286–288.

⁴ The fullest list is given by W. F. Smith in *Rev. des études rab.*, VI (1908), pp. 215–268. He includes possible as well as certain borrowings. See also L. Thuasne, *op. cit.*

⁵ See W. F. Smith in *Mod. Lang. Review*, XIII (1918), p. 437.

6. *A rich and original vocabulary.*

M. Sainéan (pp. 52-57) rightly sees in this a proof of Rabelais's authorship. He notes a few terms used only by Rabelais, such as *bagaton* (a vagabond) in c. xviii and *tahut* (a kind of ship) in c. xiv and a large number which do not occur in the preceding books—archaisms, provincialisms, especially from Poitou and Languedoc, Parisianisms, and a few, such as *chat-fourré*, *serreargent*, *papegaut*, of Rabelais's own invention. M. Villey's criticisms of all this evidence in favour of authenticity are singularly brief. 'The allusions to the country round Chinon do not at all imply,' he says, 'an intimate knowledge of the region which plays a part in *Gargantua*'—a remark which I quite fail to understand. 'The learning is common to all sixteenth-century writers¹.' Did all sixteenth-century writers know Hebrew and Greek? Were they all familiar with Erasmus and Budé, with Coelius Rhodiginus and Pierre Gilles? 'An imitator of Rabelais could not help knowing *Le Disciple de Pantagruel* or how Rabelais had already in Book III announced a voyage to Lantern-land.' This is a reasonable criticism and I admit that the borrowings from *Le Disciple*, regarded separately, are not among the strongest proofs of authenticity. Of M. Villey's disbelief in the argument derived from the use of the *Hypnerotomachia* I have already spoken. He is equally sceptical as regards the knowledge of natural history and (rather perversely) derives from M. Sainéan's book 'an impression exactly contrary to his conclusions.' The second volume (*Langue et vocabulaire*) of M. Sainéan's *La Langue de Rabelais* was published in the same year as M. Villey's volume, so that he could not record his impression of it. Another argument that he ignores besides the richness and originality of the vocabulary is the knowledge of geographical discovery—to my mind, a very strong argument.

But the weak point of M. Villey's case is that he fails to recognise that the strength of his opponents' case lies in the combined evidence for authenticity. A forger might have introduced references to Touraine and Chinon; he might have borrowed from *Le Disciple* or from the classical authors used by Rabelais in his preceding books; he might even have been at pains to translate whole chapters from that rare and costly work, the *Hypnerotomachia*; he might, indeed, had he been very ingenious, have combined all these methods of imitating Rabelais. But he must have been very learned, as well as very ingenious; he must

¹ He adds in a note, 'Of course when it is a question of classical works, like Plutarch and Lucian,' the fact that Rabelais and the author of the Fifth Book use common sources 'is of no evidential weight.'

have been a man of wide and multifarious interests, possessing an extensive knowledge of Greek and Latin and some acquaintance with Hebrew, familiar with the latest results of geographical discovery, and deeply interested in zoology and botany. He must also have been master of a rich vocabulary, and of a style which, at any rate in the last four chapters, has rarely been equalled in the whole course of French literature.

But at this point it will be well to consider separately the different episodes of which the Fifth Book is composed. M. Sainéan divides them into six great episodes and five secondary ones, but he has inadvertently omitted the Island of Tools. M. Sainéan regards all the great episodes as the finished, or nearly finished, work of Rabelais. He rightly rejects the view that the Ringing Island shows pronounced Protestant tendencies. It is merely anti-papal, just as the episode of the Papimanes in the Fourth Book is anti-papal. He meets the objections of those who say that the violent and bitter tone of the Furred Cats episode and its lack of comedy is quite unlike Rabelais¹ by pointing out that even in the preceding books, as for instance in the account of the barbarous treatment of the Chicanous (iv, xvi), anger sometimes takes the place of humour, and that in the last years of his life, when he was weary of the long-continued hostility of the Sorbonne, he was roused to righteous indignation. M. Sainéan regards the episode of *La Quinte* as the most original and profound of the Fifth Book and as one of Rabelais's most remarkable creations. This is higher praise than I should give it, but I gladly withdraw my suggestion that Rabelais suppressed it as dull and uninteresting. At any rate it is not altogether finished work (except for the game of chess) and besides the introduction of Scaliger's name (and possibly others) in c. xviii there are almost certainly interpolations in it (cc. xx and xxi). M. Sainéan points out an evident slip, clearly not due to Rabelais, in 'Je ne suis point clerc, me disoit secretement Panurge,' for Panurge was certainly a clerk and it was Father John who was fond of saying, 'Je ne suis point clerc.'

As for the Country of Satin I am in full agreement with M. Sainéan that the two chapters which it occupies could have been written by no one but Rabelais. The episode of Lantern-land seems to me also Rabelais at his best, and the debt to Lucian and *Le Disciple de Pantagruel* is in keeping with his authorship. One notes that c. xxxi is unusually

¹ M. Plattard shares this view; he also points to the absence of citations from juridical texts and (with a single exception) of terms of legal procedure (*Rev. des études rab.*, xi (1924), p. 108). Both Vauquelin de La Fresnaye, who was seventeen when Rabelais died, and Étienne Tabourot, who was born in 1549, refer to him as the creator of Grippeminaud.

short and is possibly unfinished. As for the chapter (found only in the MS.), entitled 'Comme furent les Dames Lanternes servies à soupper' everyone will agree with M. Sainéan¹ that Rabelais had nothing to do with it. I have suggested, however, that the passage which relates how the travellers chose the lantern of Pierre Amy, Rabelais's friend, for their guide is authentic, and to this suggestion I adhere. But in order to fit it on to c. xxxii some alteration in the concluding words of that chapter is required. On the final episode, the Oracle of the Bottle, M. Sainéan is very brief. I will be even briefer, for here all good Rabelaisians are agreed in recognising the master's hand.

We now come to the six secondary episodes. Except for the opening paragraphs, the second of which is expanded from *Le Disciple* (see above), M. Sainéan believes that the Island of Tools is an interpolation made up of reminiscences from Rabelais, and he refers to Marty-Laveaux's remarks on it. But Marty-Laveaux only gives one example, and in this he is clearly mistaken. The only expressions common to this chapter and to the Anatomy of Lent (iv, xxx) are *adenes* and *os*. It is certainly a dull and lifeless chapter, and Rabelais may either have laid it aside, intending to work it up into something better, or he may have definitely rejected it. The next episode, the Island of Cassade or Sharping, is not much more successful, but the description of the island, 'full of sand and barren,' corresponds exactly to Jacques Cartier's account in his Second Voyage of 'sundry little islands, barren and full of sand,' and the reference to the solemn exhibition of the MS. of the Pandects at Florence and of the handkerchief of St Veronica in St Peter's reads like a personal reminiscence. The Island of the Apedeftes is closely connected in the *Isle sonante* with the Furred Cats episode and it was so connected, I believe, by Rabelais himself. It is omitted both in the MS. and in the 1564 text, doubtless as being tedious and too technical. But, whatever its demerits, its style, as M. Boulenger says, is very correct. There is something evidently wrong about c. xvi (Island of Outre), for its heading does not correspond with its contents. Rabelais probably abandoned the chapter without finishing it. He may have intended, when he wrote it, that it should follow c. xv. The Island of Odes with its moving roads is the most interesting of the secondary episodes, the general idea being original and picturesque. The MS. has two paragraphs at the end, which are omitted in the printed text, but which have the stamp of Rabelais. As M. Sainéan says, the *Isle des Esclots* inhabited by Les Frères Fredons with its spun-out allegory and

¹ *Rev. des études rab.*, viii (1910), pp. 191-199.

absence of life is very trying to the patience of a modern reader. He rightly does not reject it on that account, but reminds us that Rabelais, like all great writers of all ages, 'sometimes slept.' Still if the canvas is Rabelais's work, most of the embroidery, with the exception of some characteristic passages, is, one suspects, by another hand. It should be noted that three of the secondary episodes (Islands of Tools, Sharping, and Odes) have no connexion either with what goes before or with what follows and that the *Isle des Esclots* is only loosely connected with the preceding episode (*La Quinte*) and with the following one (The Country of Satin), and that the latter connexion may be an interpolation. The Island of Outre was, I believe, intended by Rabelais to follow the Furred Cats but was rejected by him in favour of the Island of the Apedestres.

There remains the Prologue. In the MS. it ends abruptly after the words *encloses entre*, while in the printed text it is carried on several pages farther. It is generally agreed that none of this addition is by Rabelais, and M. Sainéan confidently condemns the rest as well. I am not so sure. The pillage of the prologues of the Third and Fourth Books, which Marty-Laveaux carefully points out, is confined to the latter portion, and I ask myself, why did the editor of the text of which the MS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale is a copy suddenly break off in the middle of a sentence?

M. Sainéan makes some very useful conjectures as to the dates at which some of the different episodes were written. He thinks that the conception and the execution of the new book took place in the interval between the publication of the partial edition of the Fourth Book in 1548 and Rabelais's death. The idea of the Ringing Island was certainly, he says, conceived during his last visit to Rome, 1548-1549, and may have been written soon after his return to France in November 1549. An alternative is that, though it was the fruit of his visit to Rome, it was not written till the time of the Gallican crisis, that is to say, between July and October 1551. But it may have been rejected, at any rate, temporarily, in favour of the more humorous and less compromising episode of the Papimanes. On his return from Rome, Rabelais stopped at Lyons and visited the zoological collections of Hans Kleberger and Charles Marais, to which there are references in the Country of Satin. M. Sainéan therefore conjectures that this episode was written in 1550¹. Another tempting conjecture is that *La Quinte* is an echo of the controversy between Ramus and Galland in 1549-1551. It is re-

¹ He also conjectures that the episode of the Island of Medamothi (iv, ii) was written about the same time. This is very probable.

ferred to in the Prologue to the Fourth Book, to which Rabelais put the finishing touches in November or December 1551. Rather later in date, according to M. Sainéan, is the episode of the Furred Cats, which he thinks was written just after the condemnation of the Fourth Book by the *Parlement* (1 March 1552). Finally, he supposes that the last two episodes, the Country of Lanternois and the Oracle of the Bottle, were completed as we have them shortly before Rabelais's death, but that some parts, as for example the extracts from the *Hypnerotomachia*, still required working up. As I have said above, I feel doubtful about the *Hypnerotomachia*, but c. xxxiv at any rate seems to be still in the rough. The only indication of date in the minor episodes is the reference to Florence and Rome in the Island of Odes, which may be taken as showing that it was written after Rabelais's return to Paris towards the end of 1549, but not necessarily immediately after. W. F. Smith's view that part of the Fifth Book was written before the Fourth and even before the Third Book must be definitely rejected. To the argument from the moons in c. iii, which M. Villey quite fairly ridicules, I attach no weight and I willingly abandon it.

There is one more point. It is usually implied that the imitator of Rabelais, or the editor of Rabelais's manuscript, if that be the view adopted, is responsible for the whole book. I leave it to those who deny its authenticity to explain how the imitator, if imitator it be, set to work. But as a supporter of its authenticity I feel bound, even at the risk of a little repetition, to state clearly what, in my opinion, took place. I believe that some unauthorised person, whom we will call X, got hold of a portion of Rabelais's manuscripts and without making a single alteration either copied it or had it copied. Then he handed over the copy, which is the work of a man who is at once ignorant and stupid, to a printer and took no further trouble about it. The result was the *Isle sonante*. Two years (more or less) later another person, whom we will call Y, and who was more active, more learned, and more intelligent than X, found some more of Rabelais's manuscripts. From these and the manuscripts discovered by X he constructed the Fifth Book, making some intelligent and sound corrections of the printed text and using for the rest that licence with regard to alteration and interpolation which sixteenth-century editors not unfrequently permitted themselves. Of this revised text, which is now represented only by a late sixteenth-century copy, made by a faithful but unlearned and unintelligent Parisian scribe, he had a copy made. This he put in the hands of a Lyons printer, who employed as editor a man whose methods

were less conservative than those of Y. This editor, who may just possibly have been Louis Turquet de Mayerne, resorted freely to conjectures, many of which are demonstrably wrong, and interpolated a few passages. The result was the text of 1564.

The above narrative may seem rather complicated and in places conjectural, but it corresponds, I submit, to the facts as we have them.

A. TILLEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

A MINOR ITALIAN CRITIC OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY: JASON DENORES

THE profusion of literary criticism in sixteenth-century Italy has inevitably led to the neglect of the work of a few minor critics. Attention, especially in England, has been focussed on Giralaldi, Scaliger, Minturno and Castelvetro, while a more limited recognition has been accorded to the pioneer commentators of Aristotle's *Poetics*—Robortelli, Bernardo Segni, Maggi, Vettori and Varchi. Consequently there still remain one or two critics, especially of the later years of the century, who are more or less unknown. Jason Denores is one, Niccolò Rossi is another. If Denores is known at all it is as Guarini's opponent in the controversy over the *Pastor Fido*. As a critic of tragedy, comedy and heroic poetry, however, he has been treated with a neglect that is by no means wholly deserved, for he not only plays an important part in a famous literary war but displays in his work that main current of general feeling which is sometimes lost in the major writers¹.

Jason Denores² was born at Nicosia, in the island of Cyprus, probably about 1530³. His family, which hailed originally from Normandy, was one of rank and power in the island, as is shown by the fact that its members held no less than seven feudal fiefs, whereas the usual holding, even in the noblest families, was but one⁴. Three of these fiefs were in

¹ There is only a passing reference to Denores in Spingarn's *History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance*. A few quotations appear in the Introduction to Kastner and Charlton's *Poetical Works of Sir William Alexander*, vol. I (Manchester, 1921). Apart from these works, there appears to be nothing about Denores in English studies. Giuseppe Toffanin, in an interesting chapter on 'Le Polemiche sul *Pastor Fido*,' devotes considerable space to Denores the controversialist. Unfortunately, Toffanin accepts Guarini's distorted view of Denores, and his remarks on Denores' life—completely undocumented—are misleading and devoid of foundation in fact. See *La Fine dell' Umanesimo*, Turin, 1920, pp. 142–155. Biographical material regarding Denores is scanty, nor does there exist, to my knowledge, any previous account of him which adds to the information given in Tiraboschi. Vide A. Riccoboni, *De Gymnasio Patavino...Commentarium Libri Sex...* Patavii, ...MDCC, cap. XLVIII, p. 79 recto; G. Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana*, Modena, 1779, vol. VII, pt 3, cap. LVIII, p. 279; R. P. Nicéron, *Mémoires*, Paris, 1739, tome XI, pp. 255–260; *Biographie Universelle* (Nouvelle éd.), Bruxelles, 1843–7, tome XIV; *Nouvelle Biographie générale*, Paris, 1862, tome XXXVIII; Larousse, *Grand Dictionnaire universel du XIXe siècle*, Paris, 1874, vol. XI, p. 1088.

² The name was spelt variously as Denores, De Nores, de Nores in his lifetime. Nicéron insists that it should be spelt Denores (*op. cit.*).

³ His first work was published in 1553, apparently shortly after he had completed his university career.

⁴ For this and the following information regarding Denores' family, my source is his *Apologia* (1590), pp. 12 verso–14 verso. Occurring as it does in a work dedicated to two nobles who knew the facts of the case, there is no reason for doubting its authenticity.

the name of Jason's grandfather, Zacho Denores. His grandmother was the sister of Cardinal Podochatoro, who in an age of ecclesiastical corruption 'was an example of all goodness and learning to the whole of Rome.' Of her sons, one, Pietro Denores, was apparently Jason's father, while another, Giovan Denores, had a distinguished career as lawyer and diplomat. In his legal capacity he was the principal member of the body to whom was assigned the task of reforming the assizes and laws of the realm of Cyprus. His first diplomatic employment was as ambassador to the Republic of Venice, which rewarded his 'eloquence, prudence and virtue' by investing him with the County of Tripoli. To this County succeeded by hereditary right his eldest son Alvisé Denores (Jason's cousin), whose fidelity to Venice was acknowledged by his appointment, when war was feared, to the governor-generalship of all the militia. The next heir was Conte Iacomo, a man renowned throughout Italy and an intimate friend of the Cardinal da Este and the Duke of Ferrara. On him was conferred the generalship of the artillery of Cyprus. Further laurels were added to the family name when Iacomo's brother and sons received high ecclesiastical preferment from Pope Gregory XIII.

On his mother's side Denores was equally well-connected. His grandfather, Giovanni Strambali, doctor and cavalier, having become possessed of the County of Carpasso by his marriage with the daughter of Giovanneperes Fabrices, was the means whereby this County came under the sway of Venice, and in consequence he was held in esteem by the Republic.

Furthermore, no Cyprian had a closer relationship with the nobility of Venice than had Jason Denores (the boast is his own). Four of his sister's daughters had married into the aristocratic families of Mosta, Bemba, Memma and Giustiniana; while his own marriage linked him up to those of Pesara, Quirina, Nana and Canala. So much, then, to vindicate Denores' position in Cyprian and Venetian society against the unsupported witticisms of Guarini and Giuseppe Toffanin.

At an early age Denores was sent to the University of Padua. In this centre of Aristotelian philosophy—Padua was the one city which had adhered loyally to Aristotelianism even when this dominating branch of mediæval thought had fallen into disrepute at the dawn of the Renaissance—he studied letters and the sciences under the direction of Trifone Gabriele, a man equally celebrated for his learning and his virtues. A close intimacy sprang up between professor and student. The latter's first work is a memorial to Gabriele, and the dedication shows how warm

and sincere was the regard in which he was held. Towards the end of his life, Denores recalls with pride that Gabriele, 'in spite of the fact that he could have followed princes and cardinals,' had not scorned to dwell for many months in his student's house¹.

The second person under whose influence Denores came was Sperone Speroni, author of the notorious *Canace* and leader of the Academy of the 'Inflammati.' Speroni was Professor of Logic and Philosophy in the University of Padua at this time, and to him must be traced Denores' respect for the rules and especially for 'peripetia' and 'recognition.' To the end of his life Denores shows, both by flattering references and judicious borrowings, how deeply he was indebted to this man who possessed such an exaggerated importance in the eyes of the sixteenth century.

Having obtained his doctorate, Denores returned to Cyprus. It was shortly after this, in 1553, that, hearing of the death of Trifone Gabriele, he issued the work already referred to—a commentary on Horace's *Ars Poetica* based on Gabriele's talks on the subject². From the dedication—'Calcerando de Nores fratri amantissimo, & loco parentis habendo'—it is to be assumed that Denores' father was now dead and probably that two brothers were living together.

There is no record of Denores' activities for the next seventeen years. Then, in 1570, Cyprus, which had been under the sway of Venice since 1489³, fell a prey to the advancing Turks. Selim II landed an army of 60,000 men on the island. Siege was laid to Nicosia, and the city capitulated after resisting for forty-five days. Twenty thousand of the inhabitants were put to the sword. The more fortunate, including Denores, found asylum in Venice.

Hard times were in store for him for the next few years. Denuded of all his possessions, he eked out an existence partly by tutoring 'the studious and valorous youth of the nobility of Venice,' partly by lecturing, and partly no doubt by cultivating the acquaintance of the noble Venetian families to whom he was related. One mention of him during these years shows that he had early renewed his connexion with Padua. On 16 December, 1573, the Academy of the 'Rinascenti' was inaugurated in that city, and Denores was appointed reader in Rhetoric,

¹ *Apologia di Iason Denores contro l'Autore del Verrato*...In Padova...1590, p. 14 verso.

² In *Epistolam Q. Horatii Flacci de Arte Poetica* Iasonis de Nores, Cyprii, ex quotidianis Tryphonis Gabriellii sermonibus interpretatio. Eiusdem brevis, et distincta summa praeceptorum de arte dicendi ex tribus Ciceronis libris de oratore collecta. Venitiis, 1553; Paris, 1554. See p. 424, n. 3.

³ It is during this occupation of Cyprus by Venice that the action of *Othello* is supposed to take place.

with the annual emolument of fifty ducats. No mention is made of any payment to readers in other subjects; they, however, were admitted to membership of the Academy, while Denores was denied that honour¹.

That Denores had held a position of influence in Cyprus and that his fellow-refugees continued to regard him with respect are shown by their choosing him to plead their cause before the new Doge Sebastiano Veniero. The oration that he delivered on this occasion (1577)—afterwards inserted in his *Rhetorica*²—had a double effect. To the Cyprians was conceded the right to inhabit with many privileges the city of Pola; and to Denores was offered the Chair of Moral Philosophy at Padua. This professorship, which had not been filled since the death of Robortelli ten years earlier, carried with it an annual stipend of 200 florins, increased to 300 in 1589.

Relieved from financial worries, Denores was now able to devote himself more peacefully to his philosophy, and in the remaining thirteen years of his life he wrote no less than eleven of his fourteen works³. Unfortunately his *Discorso* (1587) and *Poetica* (1588) by their adverse criticism of pastoral tragicomedy involved him in a bitter polemic with Guarini, the author of the *Pastor Fido*, the play the triumph of which had ensured the survival of the new type. In the midst of the controversy Denores died, in 1590, at the age of about sixty years. To the misfortunes that had clouded his middle age had now been added the shame of his only son Pietro, exiled for slaying a Venetian noble in a duel. Denores, always over-sensitive to the opinion of the state, was overwhelmed with grief and died broken-hearted. Pietro, however, lived to earn the confidence of the Popes of Rome, and won no small literary reputation in his day.

¹ For an account of this Academy, see B. B. Bruno, 'Due Accademie padovane del cinquecento' (in *Atti e Memorie della R. Accademia di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti in Padova*, Nuova Serie, 1919–20, vol. xxxvi). Shortly after his appointment appeared the *Breve Trattato dell' Oratore* di M. Jason Denores alla studiosa et valorosa Gioventù de' Nobili della Ill. Rep. Vinitiana. *Discorso...intorno alla...Rhetorica...alla Nobilissima, & illustre Accademia de' Rinascanti...*In Padova, 1574. The dedication of the first part is the foundation for the conjecture that part of Denores' income came from tutoring these people; while the dedication of the second part is obviously an expression of gratitude to his new patrons.

² *Della Rhetorica* di Giason De Nores libri tre....In Venetia...1584, lib. iii, p. 171.

³ These fourteen works, written on a variety of subjects—poetics, rhetoric, oratory, Ciceronian philosophy, Aristotelian civil and political philosophy, geography, etc.—and including a *Panegirico in laude della Repubblica di Venetia* (Padua, 1590), were all published at Venice or Padua. The only work to pass through a second edition during the author's lifetime was the commentary on Horace's *Ars Poetica* (see p. 423, n. 2), which also had the distinction of being the only one published outside Italy. It is significant of the contemporary French predilection for Horace that not only was this work alone of the fourteen printed in France, but the section on oratory which had appeared in the Venice edition (1553) was omitted in the Paris edition of the following year.

To appreciate Denores' position in the history of sixteenth-century criticism it is essential to glance back some forty years to the dawn of literary Aristotelianism and at the same time bear in mind the religious movement of the age.

The Church and Papacy of the early years of the century were full of abuses; literature was decadent and morally rotten; politics were based on tyranny and Machiavellian philosophy; everything, in fact, in which man had part was tainted. Then came a voice from Germany raised in denunciation of this corruption of the world. Echoes were felt in many a breast throughout Europe. The Reformation was begun. Rome could not ignore indefinitely the new spiritual movement, and eventually a general council of the Church was summoned to meet at Trent (1545). The time for reunion with the Protestants was passed, so every effort was concentrated on preventing further secession. Stern measures were taken to suppress the corruptions which had given Luther his moral strength, doctrine was clearly defined, full authority was granted to the recently instituted Inquisition, and an almost ascetic ideal of religious life was set up. All phases of secular life were likewise affected by this Counter-Reformation, but nowhere were its reflections more marked than in literary criticism.

The humanists, charmed with the external beauties of the newly-discovered classics, had been unconscious of any critical problem bearing on the relation of art to morality. Literature was wholly divorced from life, and Plato reigned supreme. With the Counter-Reformation, however, there was revived St Thomas's belief that a useful end should be ascribed to all earthly things. In the light of this doctrine the critics began to tackle the moral problem as far as it concerned literature. Some utilitarian function must be found to justify its existence; but first it must be purged.

The Church saw in Plato the cause of the literary decadence of the times, and turned to Aristotle, opponent of Plato in his lifetime, for aid in the suppression of the Platonic influence. As the result, an almost canonical authority began to attach to the *Poetics*. In 1548, during a lull in the Council of Trent, there appeared the first commentary on the *Poetics*, that of Robortelli. From that date a critical reform, as remarkable in its way as the religious, set in. The two movements joined forces, and in less than a decade the whole tone of criticism was changed. For the hedonism of the first half of the century was substituted the moralism of the Counter-Reformation.

Robortelli seems to have commentated Aristotle in the spirit of Valla

and Pazzi, that is in the humanist spirit of scholarly vanity. He was not a moralist. It was Vincenzo Maggi (1550) (contemporarily known as the 'Pius Madius') who, by a revolutionary reversion to the thought of the despised Middle Ages, to St Augustine and Dante, first interpreted Aristotle wholly in the light of moralism. In the opinion of Benedetto Varchi (1553), literature, like all the other activities of the human spirit, must be subjected to the strictest religious scruple. It must, moreover, justify its existence by proving its utility not only to religion but also to the state. Its object, in fact, is to subserve the ends of moral and political philosophy. This is a doctrine destined to find fuller expression in Denores some thirty-five years later.

Even more didactic than Varchi is Scaliger (1561). He dropped catharsis because he saw that Aristotle had not given it a didactic function. The influence of Varchi's new doctrine is visible in the fact that Scaliger no longer talks of the 'spectator' but only of the 'citizen.' An interesting critic also is Minturno. Rather sceptical as to the moral value of poetry in his *De Poeta* (1559), he comes round to the orthodox view in his vernacular *Arte Poetica* (1564). Why this change of front? It is difficult to say, but it may not be irrelevant to point out that in the interval between the two treatises he had attended the last session of the Council of Trent in his official capacity as a bishop of the Church. Here he may well have been impressed by the importance of the moral problem as applied to poetry¹.

The first to tinge criticism with heresy was Castelvetro (1570). Controversialist and rebel by nature, he commentated the *Poetics* in a spirit of revolt against the Counter-Reformation. Tragedy he treated from a practical, dramaturgic point of view. As regards its function, he denied that it seeks to teach, or reform, or purge the passions. Delight is the undivided end at which it aims. Didacticism is the stock-in-trade of the moral philosopher, but the dramatist must cater for the pleasure of the groundlings (the 'moltitudine rozza'). The austere Piccolomini (1575) sought to counteract this new hedonism by showing how poetry might be at one and the same time an expression of religion and of beauty. Yet Castelvetro's view gained ground, even within the Church itself. The *Pastor Fido*—licensed by the Inquisition—assured its acceptance in the realm of practical art; while in criticism Riccoboni (1587), an official critic of the Church, praised Castelvetro alone of all previous commentators on the *Poetics* and accepted his hedonistic heresy.

¹ G. Toffanin, *op. cit.*, cap. VIII, and the subsequent controversy with Ant. Belloni in *Giornale Storico*, vol. LXXXIV, pp. 211-14, and pp. 367-76.

In the same year the last bold stand for moralism was made by Denores. But it was to no purpose that he repeated with added emphasis the doctrines of Varchi and Scaliger. The cause of moralism was no longer the cause of the Church. A few minor critics such as Agnolo Segni, Viperano, Landi, Summo and Buonamici continued the fight, but the victory lay with the advocates of delight. Pontanus (1594), the first of many Jesuits to treat of poetry, feeling that art is vain, accepted their view.

The rigour of the early years was no longer necessary. The Counter-Reformation had achieved its purpose. The Papacy was regenerate and once more spiritually dominant; disciplined Catholicism presented a solid front to disintegrating Protestantism; and, among other things, literature was—theoretically, at least—purged. In consequence a more liberal policy could be pursued.

It is, then, as the last important exponent of the moralist outlook that Denores must be considered. His views on poetry are not original or particularly enlightened, but they are at least emphatic and sincere. Often he restates older theories with a detail that is illuminating, and his discussion of poetry in its relations to philosophy marks an advance—even if an advance in the wrong direction—upon his predecessors. An extreme reactionary, he has a documentary importance that entitles his views to more consideration than they have yet received.

The fundamental basis of his criticism is his conviction that poetry is deeply indebted to moral and civil philosophy, from which, indeed, it derives its origin. Unfortunately he attributes the same belief to the Aristotle of the *Poetics*. As a result, Aristotle is always misrepresented as a moral and civil philosopher with a utilitarian aim, never as the æsthetic philosopher that he really was. In excuse for Denores it may be observed that he is no different from the rest of his age in his conception of Aristotle's theories.

Discussing the relative values of poetry and philosophy, he says:

Poetry...is in part equal to philosophy, in that it seeks to purge the mind of the most important passions and substitute virtue; in part superior to it, in that it willingly proceeds according to laws and restrictions. What is more effective, in persecuting tyrants and wicked princes, in restraining our minds from ambition, in elevating us to illustrious and magnanimous undertakings, than Poetry, with its joys and delights¹?

Only three forms of poetry, however, can perform these functions—Tragedy, Comedy, and the Heroic Poem. These alone can be recited

¹ *Poetica* di Iason Denores nella qual per via di Definitione e divisione si tratta secondo l'opinion d'Aristotele della Tragedia, del Poema Heroico e della Comedia. In Padova, 1588. Ded. Ep. (The translation here and elsewhere is my own.)

to masses of citizens, and so, by their cathartic qualities, help in the government of republics. Denores follows Aristotle in limiting his treatment to these three forms. We, in our turn, will limit ourselves to a consideration of some of his views on tragedy alone¹.

First and foremost, tragedy is an imitation by means of representation—not narration—of a single action that is marvellous, complete, and of a suitable magnitude. Denores further defines the action as horrible and wretched, yet possible, affecting, and based on an adverse change of fortune. It should be interwoven with peripetia and recognition, yet not encumbered with episodes that are neither necessary nor verisimile². The tone should not be one of monotonous unhappiness, nor should the change of fortune be from misery to felicity, since this does not evoke the tragic emotions of pity and terror. Denores, therefore, unlike Giraldi, Scaliger, Castelvetro, and later, Pontanus, rules out the possibility of a happy ending for tragedy.

If a tragedy is to delight in the study as well as in the theatre, the change of fortune must not derive its impulse or its effect from a chance deed represented on the stage, but must evolve inevitably from the constitution of the fable. The cruel deeds on which the action hinges should be committed in ignorance—an ignorance that the recognition will enlighten with sickening effect. Moreover, to fulfil the requirements of the recognition, the perpetrator of these deeds and his victim should be, not enemies, nor persons indifferent to each other, but friends or kinsmen, since such alone produce the requisite terror and pity. Denores cautions the dramatist on a further point: Beware of changing the nature of some universally known tragic deed. It is no use trying to pretend that Clytemnestra did not kill Agamemnon, or Orestes Clytemnestra³. In all this there is nothing that is not to be found in Aristotle, except perhaps the stress which Denores lays on the 'marvel' aroused by the sudden change in the fortune of the great⁴. He is equally Aristotelian in discussing only those questions which are to be found

¹ Denores formally defines tragedy thus: 'La Tragedia è imitation per rappresentation di una attion maravigliosa, compita, & convenevolmente grande di persone Illustri, mezzane fra buone & cattive, negli errori humani per qualche horribilità, che, cominciando da allegrezza, finisce in infelicità nello spacio di un giro di Sole, composta con parole altiere, & gravi, & conversi; o suolti [*sic*] endecasilabi; o per il più di sette & di cinque sillabe; o con ambidue mescolatamente, & ne' chori con canzoni, & con madrigali, per purgar gli spettatori col diletto, che nasce dalla imitatione, & dalla rappresentatione dal terrore e dalla misericordia, & per fargli abhorrir la vita de' tiranni, & de' più potenti' (*Poetica*, 9 verso). The separate clauses of this definition are explained and elaborated without variation in both *Discorso* and *Poetica*.

² *Poetica*, p. 19 verso.

³ *Poetica*, p. 47 verso-48.

⁴ *Discorso* di Iason Denores intorno a quei principi, cause ed accrescimenti che la Comedia, la Tragedia e il Poema Heroico ricevono dalla Philosophia Morale etc. In Padova, 1587, pp. 16 verso-17 recto.

in the *Poetics*. He has nothing to say on the possibility of history being used as material for tragedy—a question of considerable topical interest, nor does he forbid deaths on the stage, as many of his contemporaries, following Horace, did. His treatment of the Unities is similarly influenced.

In all his definitions Denores assumes the Unity of Action, but he never discusses, as Castelvetro, for instance, had done, the limits consistent with unity. One gathers, however, that he stood for unity in the narrowest sense. His main objection to tragicomedy was that its fable would of necessity be double, and he points out that if two actions, both comic, be not allowed in comedy, it is impossible to admit one tragic and one comic action in tragicomedy¹.

The Unity of Time is repeatedly demanded, and its extent is defined as 'a revolution of the sun².' Aristotle had stated, without making it a law, that in practice Greek drama limited the time of action to one revolution of the sun or but little more³. This general statement had first been turned into a fixed law by Giraldi, who, with the eye of a dramaturgist, saw how the brevity of time heightened the marvel of the change of fortune. Subsequent critics accepted the Unity of Time as a dramatic necessity, but varied in their interpretation of its limits. Denores agrees with Castelvetro in fixing the extreme limit at twelve hours but not, like Castelvetro, in the belief that verisimilitude necessitated the coincidence of the time of action with that of representation⁴.

The third Unity, that of Place, first formulated by Castelvetro in 1570⁵, finds no mention in Denores, probably because there is no justification for it in Aristotle. It is a peculiar fact that Castelvetro's statement of the Unities, so influential abroad, had no effect on subsequent Italian critics of the sixteenth century. Perhaps the reason is to be sought in the extreme conservatism of these critics and in their complete lack of Castelvetro's dramaturgic outlook. However this may be, they did at least avoid Castelvetro's pitfall of deducing the Unity of Action as a necessary corollary of the Unities of Time and Place.

The characters of tragedy are prescribed in the Aristotelian way as illustrious, intermediate between good and evil, and liable to fall into human errors. They are illustrious from the point of view of social position—kings, princes or great leaders; thus had the traditional view of the Middle Ages conceived them and thus the Renaissance accepted

¹ *Discorso*, p. 39.

² *Vide supra*, p. 428, n. 1.

³ *Poetics*, v, 4 (Butcher's translation, 1922).

⁴ Castelvetro, *Poetica* (1570), pp. 57, 109, 163.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 535.

them with little questioning. In moral condition they should be neither wholly good nor wholly bad, neither saint nor villain; but men whose moral nature approximates to our own and whose fall thus produces in us the greatest cathartic effect.

The tragic change of fortune hinges on the aptness of men to err. If illustrious men fall into error, divine providence pounces on them and chastises them with wholly disproportionate rigour. It is on the plea of their sinning through human error that Denores, loyal to Speroni, attempts a defence of the incestuous pair of the *Canace*¹. Denores, so far a faithful Aristotelian, becomes a rank Horatian in this discussion of character in the abstract. Though void of originality, his remarks on this topic are interesting for the extreme thoroughness and precision with which he classifies his borrowed material.

'The character of the persons introduced into tragedies,' he says, 'is nothing but a certain representation of the persons...as good and bad, or suitable and unsuitable, or like and unlike, or equal and unequal; because they must be described as being in one of these four conditions.' He then proceeds to explain these cryptic remarks by dealing with each 'condition' in turn.

(i) The first is '*la Bontà de' Costumi*.' This represents the essential, every-day nature of a man as shown in deliberate, foreseen actions, and not in those performed impulsively on the spur of the moment. Aristotle is cited as explaining this 'condition' in his *Ethics* (Bks. II, III) and *Rhetoric* (Bk. II). In this lies the germ of Shakespeare's practice of making action an expression of character.

(ii) The second 'condition' is '*la Convenienza, & il Decoro de' Costumi*.' According to this Jonsonian conception, character varies according to

age, temperament,...fortune, sex, nationality and profession, since one manner of speech is attributed to an old man, another to a youth, another to a man of middle-age; one to a wrathful, another to a timid; one to a man, another to a woman; one to a Spaniard, another to a Frenchman and yet another to an Italian; one to a man of religion; another to a philosopher, and a third to a merchant; according to the opinions which are commonly held concerning each of these.

Thus humanity is split up into types, and the individual ceases to exist.

(iii) The third is '*la Similitudine de' Costumi*,' according to which, in Denores' opinion, dramatists introducing characters already represented should draw them as their first creators drew them; for instance, to Hercules and Medea should be ascribed the characteristics found in

¹ *Discorso*, p. 12 verso, 'non è in tutto cattiva Canace, & Macareo perche hanno peccato per incontinentia.'

Homer and other ancient writers. Other critics, Denores remarks, understand this condition as signifying similarity according to contemporary usage; for example, to a captain or king must be attributed the characteristics of a sixteenth-century captain or king. These critics justify their view from Sophocles' practice: his Oedipus is the popular king of his own time, consulting with subjects in the public highway, and so on.

(iv) Finally, we have 'la Equalità de' Costumi,' which requires a character to remain unchanged from the beginning of a play to the end. 'If, in the beginning, we attribute to a character cruelty, we ought to continue to paint him as cruel...as Seneca does in *Octavia*, where he represents Nero as most cruel uniformly from beginning to end¹.' By this, psychological development is dogmatically forbidden, and the change of fortune which Denores insists on elsewhere is permitted to have no effect on the hero's nature.

These trivial prescriptions—Castelvetro had referred to similar ones in Minturno and Scaliger as 'twaddle²'—make no allowance for the creation of new or for the variation of existing characters. Horace, Pollux and the practice of the Roman stage are responsible for this exaggerated notion of decorum which lay like a blight on the dramatic activity of sixteenth-century Italy. Unfortunately none of the dramatists, and only Castelvetro among the critics, showed any ability or desire to revolt against its tyranny. The average writer, well represented by Denores, considered that to ring the changes on the stock types of character so carefully assorted and labelled was to display a great variety of natures and introduce the audience to an intimate knowledge of human life. Denores' words are worth quoting:

And who is he that does not exalt to the sky the wit of the poet who represents with words so great a variety of natures? Who will ever say that it is not even useful for them to comprehend all these qualities and conditions of men, and to distinguish the good from the bad, in order to understand both themselves and the practice of our life? This is a doctrine which is learnt unconsciously. This is a moral and civil philosophy which is not learnt from readers and by study in the schools, but from poets with the greatest delight in the theatres³.

Characterisation, therefore, aims at didacticism and so contributes its share to the function of the whole.

What is the function of tragedy? Purgation with a view to moral and political utilitarianism—'to purge the spectators of terror and pity by means of the delight which springs from the imitation and the representation, and to make them detest the life of tyrants and of the most powerful⁴.'

¹ *Poetica*, pp. 27 verso–28 verso.

² Castelvetro, *op. cit.*, p. 140. His word is 'cianceie.'

³ *Discorso*, p. 30 recto–verso.

⁴ *Vide supra*, p. 428, n. 1.

The end of tragedy is thus 'different from that of the heroic poem, which does not purge the passions but instils virtue into the minds of the listeners; and from the end of comedy, which does not purge terror and pity, but those torments which disturb our quiet and tranquillity,' such as the 'amours' of wives and daughters¹.

It is to be observed that Aristotle's conception of catharsis as the auto-purgation of pity and fear² has yielded to purgation of pity and terror by means of delight, while Varchi's idea of making tragedy serve the state has been adopted. Tragedies supply useful propaganda against tyranny, says Denores. He goes on to find a far more surprising function for them—to train citizens for military service and the defence of the fatherland! He explains the method thus: 'Now the purgation of terror and pity in the minds of the citizens is nothing else but to accustom them, by long usage, to feel no fear or pity at any atrocious and wretched event that is presented before them.' Hence they will be undaunted when, in battle for the first time, they see a friend or parent slaughtered. The Greeks achieved this by means of tragedies, the Romans—and the comparison seems rather degrading to tragedy—by gladiatorial combats. Many tragic writers, Denores says, obsessed with this view of the object of purgation, only trouble to purge the audience of pity and terror, since these emotions alone affect military efficiency³.

Yet another use does the orthodox Denores find for tragedy: it may be valuable as an instrument in Catholic propaganda. Speaking of that group of tragedies mentioned by Aristotle, in which are introduced actions that have taken place in the underworld (for instance, those dealing with Tantalus, Ixion, Prometheus), Denores says that such 'Tragedia Infernale' would be useful in his own times 'to inspire terror in heretics and sinners by representing their torments, as if one should compose a tragedy about Martin Luther, the Jews, Turks, Infidels and all others like them⁴.'

Throughout this discussion of the elements of tragedy, he keeps a steady eye on their ability to affect the emotions of pity and terror. The illustrious hero whose change of fortune has such a devastating effect when compared with that of a private man⁵; his 'mezzana' moral nature which brings his error home to us with added force; the invariably sad ending; the brevity of the time of action, with its heightening

¹ *Poetica*, p. 7 verso. Cf. *Discorso*, p. 15 recto.

² *Poetics*, vi, 2 (ed. Butcher, 1922).

³ *Discorso*, p. 14 recto-verso.

⁴ *Poetica*, p. 27 recto.

⁵ *Discorso*, p. 14 recto, where Denores shows how the same action has different effects when applied to illustrious and then to private people. He exemplifies his remarks from the Tancred and Gismonda story.

of the marvel; the diction, which sways the emotions of the audience to the poet's will or impresses by its wealth of moral 'sentences'¹;—all these bear directly on the end of the whole.

Who therefore among the spectators is not fired with a longing for private life and with an abhorrence of the tyrannical life of the most powerful, seeing and considering that all their greatness is liable, as it were in the twinkling of an eye, to change to extreme ruin, exile, death and slaughter?²

Pastoral tragicomedy, it may be noted in passing, is condemned because it serves none of these purposes. It is

a...composition cut off of its own accord from the principles...and rules of moral and civil philosophers, of legislators, and governors of republics; being of no benefit to those who dwell in cities, and...without any useful end, which should never be lacking in those compositions which are recited in public to the citizens of any well-ordered republic³.

If further condemnation is necessary, it is to be found in the fact that pastoral tragicomedy is one of those mixed forms of poetry which are 'prodigious and monstrous,' as would be 'tragicomedia, comicotragedia, tragicosatura,' and other such forms⁴. We can almost imagine that had Denores named these 'other such forms,' he would have continued with the 'pastoral-comical, historical-pastoral, tragical-historical, tragical-comical-historical-pastoral' of the worthy Polonius⁵.

These remarks are sufficient to indicate Denores' general outlook. That he is not a great critic may be readily confessed: he is too completely in accord with the moralist spirit of the mid-century to be so. With all his knowledge of Aristotle (he was, we have seen, Professor of Moral Philosophy in the most Aristotelian of Italian universities), he fails to distinguish the æsthetic spirit of the *Poetics* from the philosophic outlook of the *Rhetoric* and *Ethics*, with the unhappy result that he interprets the first treatise in the light of the other two and so is led to suppress all the purely poetic qualities of tragedy in favour of a super-imposed utilitarianism. To a study of poetry he brings a mind untrained in poetry, and to a discussion of tragedy an absolute lack of dramaturgic experience. Small wonder is it, therefore, that his criticism has no æsthetic and very little practical value.

Yet in his day he was not without an influence on practising dramatists—an influence that does not exist wholly in his own imagination. In the *Poetica*⁶ he regrets that before writing he had not seen those recent works in which all his precepts are diligently observed, works that raise his age to the level of those of the Greeks and Latins. As an

¹ *Poetica*, p. 30 recto.

² *Discorso*, p. 17 recto.

³ *Discorso*, pp. 39 verso–40 recto; cf. *Apologia*, p. 43 verso.

⁴ *Apologia*, p. 31 recto.

⁵ *Hamlet*, II, ii, 425–7.

⁶ *Poetica*, 'Introduzione intorno al presente trattato della Poetica.'

example of these masterpieces, he quotes, among others, Manfredi's *Semiramis*. It is indeed regrettable that he had not seen this tragedy (equal to *Canace* and *Orbecche* combined for horrors and surpassing the first in having a double incest), for had he done so he would have found it difficult to reconcile the play to his strict moralistic purpose.

Again, at the end of his treatment of tragedy, he illustrates from a novel of Boccaccio the argument of the perfect tragedy¹. The story turns on the adultery of M. Guglielmo Guardastagno with the wife of his bosom friend Rossiglione. The injured man slays the traitor, tears out his heart, cooks it, and induces the erring wife to eat it. On learning what it is she has eaten she promptly casts herself out of a lofty window and is killed. It is difficult to see how such a story is to serve the state. It might possibly check adultery and save coroners' fees, but scarcely make good soldiers. Yet much is revealed by Denores' offering this subject as an ideal one for tragedy. We see from it that, when left to his own initiative, he immediately deserts Greek subjects in favour of fictitious, romantic material, soaked in the 'revenge for honour' atmosphere and, above all, drawn from 'novella' sources. And because Denores is in agreement with popular taste in this, his influence is sufficiently strong to induce a minor dramatist to turn this ideal story into a tragedy of thoroughly sixteenth-century nature².

F. E. BUDD.

LONDON.

¹ *Poetica*, pp. 48 verso-56 verso.

² The *Sormonda* of Bartolomeo Tanni. The simplicity of Boccaccio's novel degenerates to poverty in the tragedy, as usual in the sixteenth century. Tanni adds a Ghost as Prologue, restricts the action to the period from dawn to evening, and, to render the characters more illustrious than they already were in Boccaccio and Denores, makes Rossiglione a king and his wife Sormonda a queen.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

THE NEW CHAUCER ITEMS

The text of the three new life-records of Chaucer which Professor Ernest Kuhl brought to the attention of Chaucer scholars in *Modern Language Notes* of December, 1925, is as follows¹:

Close Roll 236, 18 Richard II, m. 15d, Feb. 21, 1395. De carta irrotulata.

Sciunt presentes et futuri quod nos Thomas de Arundell' Dei gracia Eboracensis Archiepiscopus Anglie Primas et Apostolice Sedis Legatus, dedimus et concessimus et hac presenti carta nostra confirmavimus dominis Willelmo Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi Roberto Episcopo Londonensi Iohanni Episcopo Sarum Iohanni domino de Lovell Thome Percy chiualer Ricardo Abberbury chiualer Roberto Cherleton' chiualer Philippo de Vache chiualer, Iohanni Scarle, Willelmo atte Wode, Simoni Dodyngton² clericis, Roberto Stokley Willelmo Gascoigne et Iohanni Woderoue totum manerium nostrum vocatum Spitelcombe cum suis pertinenciis ac duo molendina aquatica et omnia alia terras et tenementa redditus seruicia simul cum pratis pascuis pasturis aquis piscariis wardis releuiis escaetis et ceteris suis pertinenciis iuribus et commoditatibus quibuscumque in Combe vocata Westcombe et Spitelcombe et in villis de Estgrenewych Cherleton Whritelmarssh et Depford in comitatu Kancia que quidem manerium molendina terras tenementa redditus seruicia simul cum pratis pascuis pasturis aquis piscariis wardis releuiis escaetis et suis pertinenciis uniuersis nuper habuimus ex dono et feoffamento Willelmi Staundon' et Agnetis uxoris sue tam per cartam quam per finem in Curia domini Regis inde leuatam ac eciam quatuor acras tres rodas et tresdecim perticatas terre cum fossatis et aliis suis pertinenciis eidem terre adiacentibus in Hornemerssh in parochia de Estgrenewych in comitatu predicto quas nuper habuimus ex dono et feoffamento Iohannis Longe et Iohannis Cooke et Alicie uxoris sue Habendum et tenendum omnia predicta manerium terras tenementa redditus seruicia et molendina cum pratis pascuis pasturis aquis piscariis wardis releuiis escaetis et ceteris suis pertinenciis iuribus et commoditatibus quibuscumque unacum quatuor acris tribus rodibus et tresdecim perticatis terre cum fossatis et aliis suis pertinenciis in Hornemerssh predicta prefatis dominis Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi Episcopo Londonensi Episcopo Sarum domino de Louell Thome Percy Ricardo Abberbury Roberto Cherleton Philippo la Vache chiualers Iohanni Scarle Willelmo atte Wode Simoni Dodyngton clericis Roberto Stokley Willelmo Gascoigne et Iohanni Woderoue heredibus et assignatis suis libere quiete bene et in pace imperpetuum de capitalibus dominis feodorum per seruicia inde debita et de iure consueta. Et nos vero Thomas de Arundell et heredes nostri predicti omnia predicta manerium molendina terras et tenementa redditus et seruicia cum omnibus suis pertinenciis ut predictum est prefatis dominis Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi Episcopo Londonensi episcopo Sarum domino de Louell Thome Percy Ricardo Abberbury Roberto Cherleton Philippo la Vache chiualers Iohanni Scarle Willelmo atte Wode Simon Dodyngton clericis Roberto Stokley Willelmo Gascoigne et Iohanni Woderoue heredibus et assignatis suis contra omnes gentes warantizabimus imperpetuum. In cuius rei testimonium huic presenti carte nostre sigillum nostrum apposuimus. Hiis

¹ *Modern Language Notes*, XL, pp. 511 ff. I happened to find these documents in the *Calendar of the Close Rolls* a few weeks after Professor Kuhl's article was published and had already obtained copies of them before I saw the article. Having ascertained from Professor Kuhl that he had not intended to print the originals himself I have thought it worth while to make my copies available for general reference.

² My copyist notes that this name is printed Dudyngton in the *Calendar* but is clearly Dodyngton.

testibus Galfrido Chaucer Hugone de Midelton Ricardo Rowe Iohanne Fox Thoma Baker Willelmo Couper Iohanne Longe Willelmo Symond' de Grenewych' Iohanne Cheseman de Depford et aliis. Data apud Combe vicesimo primo die Februarii anno regni regis Ricardi secundi decimo octauo.

Et memorandum quod predictus Archiepiscopus Eboracensis venit coram Petro de Barton clerico apud ecclesiam Noui Templi London' vicesimo quarto die Februarii anno presenti virtute brevis domini Regis *dedimus potestatem* eidem Petro directi et in filiis de hoc anno residentis et recognouit cartam predictam et omnia contenta in eadem in forma predicta.

Close Roll 237, 19 Richard II, m. 9d, March 5, 1396. De scripto irrotulato.

Pateat uniuersis per presentes quod nos Thomas de Arundell Dei gracia Eboracensis Archiepiscopus Anglie Primas et Apostolice Sedis Legatus assignauimus et loco nostro posuimus dilectos nobis in Christo Henricum de Wynchestre capellanum et Iohannem Norwyth attornatos nostros coniunctim et diuim ad capiendum et recipiendum pro nobis et nomine nostro et ad opus nostrum plenariam seisinam et possessionem de toto manerio vocato Spitelcombe cum suis pertinenciis ac de duobus molendinis aquaticis et omnibus aliis terris tenementis redditibus et seruiciis simul cum pratis pascuis pasturis aquis piscariis wardis releuiis escaetis et ceteris suis pertinenciis iuribus et commoditatibus quibuscumque in Combe vocata Westcombe et Spitelcombe et in ville de Estgrenewych Cherleton Whrytelmerssh et Depford in comitatu Kancia et eiam de quatuor acris tribus rodīs et tresdecim particatis terre cum fossatis et aliis suis pertinenciis eidem terre adiacentibus in Hornemerssh in parochia de Estgrenewych in comitatu predicto velud ex feoffamento dominorum Willelmi Dei gracia Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi tocius Anglie Primatis et Apostolici Sedis Legati Roberti Episcopi Londonensis Iohannis domini de Louell Thome Percy chiualer Ricardi Abberbury chiualer Philippi La Vache chiualer Iohannis Scarle Willelmi atte Wode Simonis Dudyngton clericorum Roberti Stokleye Willelmi Gascoigne et Iohannis Woderoue secundum vim formam et effectum carte sue inde nobis facte. In cuius rei testimonium sigillum nostrum presentibus apposuius Hiis testibus Galfrido Chaucer Hugone de Middelton Ricardo Rowe Iohanne Fox Thoma Baker Willelmo Couper Iohanne Longe Willelmo Symond de Grenewych Iohanne Chesman de Depford et aliis. Datum quinto die Marci anno domini millesimo c.c.c.^{mo} nonagesimo quinto et regni Regis Ricardi secundi post Conquestum Anglie decimo nono.

Et memorandum quod predictus Archiepiscopus Eboracensis venit in Cancellariam Regis apud Westmonasterium primo die Maii anno presenti et recognouit scriptum predictum et omnia contenta in eodem in forma predicta.

Close Roll 237, 19 Richard II, m. 6d, April 6, 1396¹. De carta irrotulata.

Sciunt presentes et futuri quod nos Thomas de Arundell Dei gracia Eboracensis Archiepiscopus Anglie Primas et Apostolice sedis Legatus dedimus concessimus et hac presenti carta nostra confirmauimus Gregorio Ballard totum manerium nostrum vocatum Spitelcombe cum suis pertinenciis ac duo molendina aquatica et omnia alia terras tenementa nostra redditus et seruicia simul cum pratis pascuis pasturis aquis piscariis wardis releuiis escaetis et ceteris suis pertinenciis iuribus et commoditatibus quibuscumque in Combe vocata Westcombe et Spitelcombe et in villis de Estgrenewych Cherleton Whrytemerssh et Depford in comitatu Kancia ac eiam quatuor acras tres rodas et tresdecim particatas terre cum fossatis et aliis suis pertinenciis eidem terre adiacentibus in Hornemerssh in parochia de Estgrenewych in comitatu predicto Habendum et tenendum omnia predicta manerium terras tenementa redditus seruicia et molendina cum pratis pascuis pasturis aquis piscariis wardis releuiis escaetis et ceteris suis pertinenciis iuribus et commoditatibus quibuscumque unacum quatuor acris tribus rodīs et tresdecim particatis terre cum fossatis et aliis suis pertinenciis in Hornemerssh predicta prefato Gregorio heredibus et assignatis suis libere quiete bene et in pace imperpetuum de capitalibus dominis feodorum per

¹ My copyist notes that the word 'Hastynges' is roughly written in a later hand in the margin against this entry and also against the following one, in which the name occurs.

servicia inde debita et de iure consueta. In cuius rei testimonium huic presenti carte sigillum nostrum apposuimus. Hiis testibus Galfrido Chaucer Hugone de Middleton Ricardo Rowe Iohanne Fox Thoma Baker Willelmo Couper Iohanne Longe Willelmo Symond de Grenewych Iohanne Chesman de Depford et aliis. Data apud Combe sexto die Aprilis anno domini millesimo ccc^{mo}. nonagesimo sexto et regni Regis Ricardi secundi post conquestum Anglie decimo nono.

Et memorandum quod predictus Archiepiscopus venit in Cancellariam Regis apud Westmonasterium primo die Maii anno presenti et recognovit cartam predictam et omnia contenta in eadem in forma predicta.

All three documents, it will be observed, concern identical properties in Combe, East Greenwich, and other places in the county of Kent. The Close Rolls and Patent Rolls of the years 1395–1397 contain altogether eight documents relating to these properties: the three documents printed above, a document dated April 6, 1396, appearing in the *Life-Records of Chaucer* as No. 260, another document of the same date referred to by Professor Kuhl, and three others. The contents of these eight documents is briefly as follows:

Feb. 21, 1395. Thomas de Arundell, archbishop of York, to William, archbishop of Canterbury, and others. Charter with warranty of manor called Spitelcombe, etc.¹

Feb. 24, 1395. Thomas, archbishop of York, to William, archbishop of Canterbury, and others. Quit claim with warranty of manor called Spitelcombe, etc., which they have by his charter of feoffment².

March 5, 1396. Thomas, archbishop of York, to Henry de Wynchestre and John Norwych. Letter of attorney appointing them to receive seisin of manor called Spitelcombe, etc., as by feoffment of William, archbishop of Canterbury, and others³.

April 6, 1396. Thomas, archbishop of York, to Gregory Ballard. Charter of manor of Spitelcombe, etc.⁴

April 6, 1396. Thomas, archbishop of York, to Henry de Wynchestre and John Norwych. Letter of attorney appointing them to deliver to Gregory Ballard seisin of manor called Spitelcombe, etc.⁵

April 6, 1396. Gregory Ballard to John de Wilton, Geoffrey Chaucer, and others. Letter of attorney appointing them to receive seisin of the manor called Spitelcombe, etc., according to charter of Thomas de Arundell⁶.

May 9, 1396. Thomas, archbishop of York, to Gregory Ballard. Quit claim of manor called Spitelcombe, etc., which Gregory has by the archbishop's charter of feoffment⁷.

Oct. 7, 1397. Grant, in fee simple, to the king's esquire Gregory Ballard, the king's butler, of the manors of Westcombe and Spytelcombe, etc., late of Thomas Darundell, archbishop of Canterbury, by whose forfeiture the same belong to the king by virtue of the judgment against him in Parliament⁸.

¹ This is the first of the three documents printed above; *Calendar of the Close Rolls*, 1392–1396, pp. 402 f. My summaries of these documents are free abridgements of the summaries contained in the *Calendar*.

² *Ibid.*, p. 401.

³ This is the second of the three documents printed above; *Calendar of the Close Rolls*, 1392–1396, p. 502.

⁴ This is the third of the three documents printed above; *ibid.*, p. 508.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 497; see Kuhl, *l.c.*, p. 512.

⁶ *Calendar of the Close Rolls*, 1392–1396, p. 505; see *Life-Records*, pp. 319 f.

⁷ *Calendar of the Close Rolls*, 1392–1396, p. 511.

⁸ *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, 1396–1399, p. 216. William Courtenay, archbishop of Canterbury, died July 31, 1396, and was succeeded by Arundell, who was enthroned in February, 1397. Arundell was impeached and banished in September, 1397.

It is clear from the document of March 5, 1396, that at least one document belonging to the series is missing, namely the charter of feoffment by which William, archbishop of Canterbury, and the others transferred these properties back to Thomas, archbishop of York. This document I have not been able to find. Nor am I competent to guess the purpose of this double transfer which brought the properties again into the possession of Thomas about a year after he had granted them to William and the others.

As to the significance of these documents with reference to Chaucer, I do not believe that we are justified in inferring from them any personal relation between Chaucer and either Thomas de Arundell or the members of the other group. A personal relation between Chaucer and Gregory Ballard, on the other hand, seems clearly indicated by the document (already known from the *Life-Records*) which appoints Chaucer an attorney to receive seisin of the manor on Ballard's behalf. The most important contribution the new documents make to our knowledge of Chaucer's life is (as Professor Kuhl recognised) the evidence they furnish as to his residence in Kent in 1395 and 1396¹. This evidence is of particular interest at the present moment in view of Professor Manly's recent statement that 'there is no other evidence [than the *Envoy to Scogan*] that in 1393 (the supposed date of the *Envoy*) Chaucer was living at Greenwich².'

SAMUEL MOORE.

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN, U.S.A.

NOTES ON 'THE KNIGHTES TALE'

- A. 1612-4. That heer I wol be founden as a knight,
And bringen harneys right ynough for thee;
And chees the beste, and leve the worse for me.

Evidence of the realism of this fine chivalric, almost romantic, touch, and of the similar one in A. 1651—'Everich of hem halp for to armen other'—is furnished by Froissart. See *Chronicles* (translation by Th. Johnes, 1844), I, pp. 634-636. It is true that the tilting-match between John Bouchmel and Nicholas Clifford is a friendly one, while the combat between Palamon and Arcite is to be one 'à l'outrance'; nevertheless, the situations are strikingly similar. Like Arcite, John Bouchmel pro-

¹ Note that the first and third documents witnessed by Chaucer are dated at Combe and that in all three documents the designation 'de Grenewych' occurs after the names of the first eight witnesses and the designation 'de Depford' after the name of the ninth.

² J. M. Manly, *Some New Light on Chaucer*, pp. 40 f. It may be noted that Brusendorff, *The Chaucer Tradition*, pp. 289 ff., shows that we have about as good evidence for dating the *Envoy* 1391 as for dating it 1393.

mises to provide his antagonist with the necessary armour and to give him the first choice of the suits that he brings to the place of tilting. Next morning, says Froissart, 'they rode together to a smooth plain outside the castle where they dismounted. John Bouchmel had provided there two suits of armour according to his promise...; having had them displayed, he told the English squire to make the first choice. "No," said the Englishman, "I will not choose: you shall have the choice." John was therefore forced to choose first, which he did, and armed himself completely (in doing which he was assisted), as a good man-at-arms should be. Nicholas did the same.'

A. 1882-4. ...the dispence
Of Theseus, that goth so busily
To maken up the listes roially.

Commentators have noticed that while Boccaccio simply makes Theseus refer to 'teatro nostro' (*Teseide*, v, 97), Chaucer makes Theseus build a special lists for the tournament. This has been rightly regarded as indicating both the importance of the tournament and the magnificence of Theseus. What has not, however, been observed about this Chaucerian touch, even by Robertson in his paper on 'Elements of Realism in The Knightes Tale¹', is that it is as realistic as it is original. Cf. Froissart's *Chronicles*, II, p. 205, where we are told that on the occasion of the memorable combat between Sir John de Carogne and James le Gris, 'lists were made for the champions in the plain of St. Catherine behind the Temple; and the lords had erected on the one side scaffolds, the better to see the sight.'

A. 2153. An hundred lordes hadde he in his route.
A. 2179. An hundred lordes hadde he with him there.

It is curious that hitherto nobody, so far as I know, has noticed that, if 'An hundred lordes' in these lines is to be taken literally, Palamon and Arcite would each be accompanied, not by a hundred knights, as Theseus had said they were to be (A. 1851, 1858), but by a hundred and one. But of course the 'hundred' of the above lines is only a round number—it would have been prosaic to say ninety-nine—just as in A. 1850 'fifty wykes' is a round poetical term for a year.

A. 2450. ...to stinten stryf and drede.

What exactly is the force of 'drede' here? Does it mean 'anger, fury, violence, rage,' as in *Faerie Queene*, Bk. II, c. 5, st. 16, l. 9?

A. 2623-5. Ful ofte a-day han thise Thebanes two
Togidre y-met, and wroght his felawe wo;
Unhorsed hath ech other of hem tweye.

¹ *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XIV, pp. 226 ff.

Line 2625 has been explained in three different ways. Carpenter paraphrases it as 'Each has unhorsed the other of them two'; Pollard says, 'They had each unhorsed two knights of the opposite party'; Tatlock and Mackaye (*Modern Reader's Chaucer*, 1912) render it: 'Each had unhorsed the other twice.' It is impossible to say how other editors understand the line, since they are silent about it; but from the fact that they do not, in their glossaries, explain the 'tweye' of this line as 'twice,' it may safely be inferred that the third interpretation at least is not accepted by them.

Let us see which is the most acceptable interpretation. Carpenter's paraphrase would imply that Palamon and Arcite are unhorsed and are therefore now fighting on foot. But it does not appear from A. 2638-48 that they are fighting on foot; for, if they were, it would, in a tournament like this, surely be unchivalric, if not foul, of Emetreus, who was on horseback, to strike at Palamon on foot. In Malory's *Le Morte Darthur*, Bk. ix, ch. 33, we are indeed told that 'foot-hot Sir Palamides came upon Sir Tristram as he was on foot, to have over-ridden him,' but then Sir Palamides and Sir Tristram are inveterate enemies and, moreover, Sir Palamides is depicted as far from 'a verray parfit gentil knight.' Accordingly, though Chaucer is vague on the point (see A. 2548-50), it seems to have been understood—and so Scott understands it in his *Ivanhoe*, ch. xii—that mounted horsemen were not to assail those who were unmounted. Further, the blow with which Emetreus 'is born out of his sadel a swerdes lengthe' could scarcely have been dealt him, I imagine, by an unmounted Palamon. Lastly, in A. 2721-30, where it is apparent that the reference is especially to Palamon's 'aventure,' it will be observed that mention is made of 'his stede driven forth with staves.'

As for Pollard's rendering, neither the grammar nor the context seems to support it. 'Ech other' cannot mean simply 'ech.' Or is it supposed that 'other' is to be taken with 'tweye'? It would be surprising if 'other' were to be so taken, for Chaucer could, in that case, easily have written 'ech of hem other tweye' and, without spoiling the rhythm, avoided all ambiguity. The fact is that here the poet is not thinking of 'other tweye' at all, but only of Palamon and Arcite. The lines that immediately precede as well as those that directly follow recount the dealings of 'thise Thebanes two' with each other, and it would be a distinctly irrelevant particular to state here that each had unhorsed two of the opposite party.

There remains the third interpretation, and this I accept as the best.

'Each had unhorsed the other twice' does not imply that the combatants are now fighting on foot, and so the difficulties that arise in accepting Carpenter's rendering do not arise here. And, if parallel instances of unhorsed knights being horsed again are sought, there are several in Malory. See, for example, *Le Morte Darthur*, Bk. vii, ch. 28; Bk. ix, chs. 30, 33; Bk. xviii, ch. 23.

A. 2815. Arcite is cold, ther Mars his soule gye.

Skeat, followed by the Chambers Editor and Miss Bentinck Smith, paraphrases the latter part of the line as: 'Where I hope that Mars will guide his soul.' Liddell takes it to mean: 'Let Mars conduct his soul to the abode of spirits.' Wyatt's note reads: 'There where may Mars take charge of his soul!' But, as Tyrwhitt observed long ago, 'ther' in this passage has a peculiar force: it indicates time or occasion rather than place. And so Carpenter understands it rightly when he renders the line by, 'Therefore, may Mars take charge of his soul,' and cites:

This sentence, and an hundred things worse,
Wryteth this man, ther god his bones corse! (E. 1307-8.)

For other similar instances of the use of 'ther' in the sense of 'thereupon, therefore, at that juncture, then,' see D. 1561; *Tr. & Cr.* iii, 1436-40; and compare the following (cited in *N.E.D.* s.v. 'There 5') from *Religious Pieces from Thornton MS.*: 'At myn endyng...I pray pe lady helpe me pare.'

A. 2892 ff.

As evidence of the realism of this account of Arcite's funeral, Skeat quotes Rock's *Church of Our Fathers*, vol. ii, p. 488, and Pollard describes the similar procession at the funeral of Sir Philip Sidney, as depicted in Lant's engraving (1587). I would draw attention to Froissart's detailed account of the funeral of the Earl of Flanders in his *Chronicles*, ii, 14-17.

P. E. DUSTOOR.

ALLAHABAD, INDIA.

'A HUNDRETH SUNDRIE FLOWERS'

In her review* of Mr Ward's partial reprint of this volume (*Mod. Lang. Review*, April, 1927, p. 214) Miss Ambrose advances certain views regarding its bibliographical history which should not, I think, pass unchallenged.

She speaks, namely, of 'two entries of the book in the *Transcript of the Stationers' Register*,' as though the volume had been entered in the regular course in the books of the company. This it may have been:

but we are without information on the matter, for no book-entries between July 1571 and July 1576 are preserved. Miss Ambrose's reference (vol. v, pp. 84, 86) is merely to the 'Bibliographical Summary of English Literature,' in which Arber attempted to give a survey of the actual output of the book-trade, and which possesses no original authority. His entry of the *Hundreth Sundrie Flowers* was based on the actual book (not on any record of its publication); he gives it twice over so as to bring it both under the printer and the publisher; and (I suppose through inadvertence) he placed the two records under different years—being doubtful whether 20 Jan. 1572 in H. W.'s epistle meant 1571/2 or (as it does) 1572/3.

Starting with this quite imaginary double entry, Miss Ambrose constructs a theory of two issues of the volume, to the later of which she supposes there were appended *The Steel Glass* and *The Complaint of Philomene* (which form a single publication), because these works are bound up with the *Flowers* in copies at the British Museum and Bodleian. This addition, she says, 'was not issued separately until 1576' but 'It is conceivable that' it 'was ready for publication in 1573.' I venture, on the contrary, to think that this is wholly inconceivable. I have just examined the Museum copy to make sure: the *Steel Glass-Philomene* pamphlet seems to be identical with the separate issue, the epistle to the first part is dated 15 Apr. 1576, and the date 1576 is on the title of the second. There is no need to suppose that the two publications were brought together before the volume was bound for Charles II: of course they may have kept company from 1576 onward, though assuredly not from 1573. (I have not had the Bodleian copy in my hands recently, but I fancy it is similar to that in the Museum.) The theory that there were two issues of the *Hundreth Sundrie Flowers* has no foundation in fact.

W. W. GREG.

LONDON.

BENEDICK'S LOVE SYMPTOMS: COSMETICS AND COSTUME¹

'When was he wont to wash his face?' asks Claudio of Don Pedro during their discussion of Benedick². Richard Grant White started the oft-quoted theory, that this question implied Benedick's previous neglect of daily ablutions. Wright indignantly replied that it referred not to the use of soap and water but to that of cosmetics. Furness, agreeing

¹ This article is part of a larger study, *Costume in English Drama, 1533-1633*, resulting from the writer's tenure of the European Fellowship for 1927-8 of The American Association of University Women.

² *Much Ado*, Act III, Sc. i, 57.

with Wright, considered it followed naturally after the reference to the barber's man, and quoted Greene on facial treatments received at the hands of the barber. The statements that Benedick 'paints himself,' 'and rubs himself with civet'—in order, as Jonson said of Fastidious, 'to make his complexion strong, and the sweetness of his youth lasting in the sense of his sweet lady'—lend support to Wright's inference; and since the use of paints, of perfumes, of astringent and glazing waters or washes was common in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, his interpretation is probably correct. 'Some cannot be content as God made them,' declares Cleland, 1607, of the young noblemen of his age, 'but as though they were bundled up in hast and sent into the world not fully finished, must use drugs, balmes, ointments, paintings, *lac virginale*, and what not?...Others smell so sweetly, as if they were new arrived from Arabia, and brought home perfumes from Horontia¹.' So well known was England for the manufacture of cosmetic waters, that Esperanza Malci, in a letter to Queen Elizabeth, accompanying a gift of articles of dress from the Sultana Mother of Constantinople, 1599, begs for her royal mistress a return present of waters, since every kind is to be found in Elizabeth's kingdom².

Benedick's use of cosmetics is simply one of the 'old signs' of being 'in love with some woman.' He is conforming to the age-old lover type described in Burton's great medical treatise: 'Is this no small servitude for an inamourite to be every hour combing his head, stiffening his beard, perfuming his hair, washing his face with sweet waters, painting, curling, and not to come abroad but sprucely crowned, decked, and appareled³?' But the older lover usually sacrificed his beard. In order to look younger, Benedick gave up 'the old ornament of his cheek,'

¹ James Cleland, *The Institution of a Young Nobleman*, Oxford: Barnes, 1607, p. 216. Cp. 'There stands a Neophyte glazing of his face,' etc., *Cynthia's Revels*, Act III, Sc. iv, 54 ff.; Greene, *Quip for an Upstart Courtier*, Grosart ed. *Wks.* xi, p. 249; or Bishop Hall, to the ladies: 'hear this, ye plaster-faced Jezabels, if you will not leave your daubing and your high washes, God will one day wash them off with fire and brimstone,' *Sermon*, vii, Oxford: Talboys, 1837, Vol. v, p. 114.

² 'Et per esser sua Maesta donna senza vergogna alcuna la posio hocupar con questo aviso il qual è che trovandosi nel suo regno acque destillati fini de hogne sorte per la facia et hogli hodoriffere per le mani sua Maesta mi favorira mandarne per mia mano per il medesimo.' Ellis *Letters*, Ser. I, Vol. III, p. 54. Due to a misreading of Howe's continuation of Stowe's *Annales*, the *D.N.B.* and Shakespearean commentators give Edward Vere the credit of introducing washes and perfumes into England. Howe's statement is: 'Millioners...could not make any costly perfume or wash until about the fourteenth or fifteenth yeere of the queene, the right honorable Edward de Vere, Earle of Oxford, came from Italy, and brought with him gloves, sweet bagges...' p. 868, ed. 1614. But washes and perfumes, whether costly or not, were made in England before the birth of de Vere. Bankes, 1525, recommends rosemary boiled in white wine as a 'washe' to give a 'faire face' (E. S. Rohde, *The Old English Herbals*, London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1922, p. 56) and the Princess Mary records presents from English persons, 1536-1542, of 'sweet waters' and 'fumes' (*Privy Purse Expenses*, pp. 11, 13).

³ *Anatomy of Melancholy*, London: Bell, 1904, Vol. III, p. 185.

just as old Stratocles—who had been a ‘severe woman’s hater all his life’—falling in love with Myrilla, ‘shaved off his bushy beard and painted his face’ to improve his appearance¹.

Burton’s diagnosis of love suggests that an interest in perfumers, barbers and tailors indicates the first stage of the malady. Benedick’s interest includes tailors. He marks what hats, bands, doublets, breeches are in fashion, and appears as ‘a Dutchman today, a Frenchman tomorrow, or in the shape of two countries at once, as a German from the waist downward, all slops, and a Spaniard from the hip upward, no doublet².’ But the searcher need not go to Burton to find Benedick’s behaviour paralleled. Perrin tells how the French lover, also, alters his complexion and invents ‘des habits nouveaux’ to attract his loved one:

L’homme ha tousjours mesme corps, mesme teste, mesme bras, jambes, et piez; mais il les diversifie de tant de sortes, qu’il semble tous les jours estre renouvelé: chemises parfumées de mile et mile sortes d’ouvrages; bonnet à la saison, pourpoint, chausses jointes et serrées, montrans les mouvemens du corps bien disposé; mile façons de bottines, brodequins, escarpins, souliers, sayons, casaquins, robes, cappes, manteaus: le tout en si bon ordre, que rien ne passe³.

In Benedick, then, Shakespeare is presenting, not a new character, but the conventional lover who behaved in the manner familiar to Elizabethan audiences—who followed the ‘common humor of all suitors to trick themselves up, to be prodigal in apparel...with every day new suits as the fashion varies⁴.’

MARIE CHANNING LINTHICUM.

URBANA, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

LINCOLN V. DYMOCK AND A SCURRILOUS PLAY, 1610

‘Even provincial plays sometimes brought their promoters before the Star Chamber.’ This statement of Sir E. K. Chambers⁵ refers to the case in which Sir Edward Dymock, a man of standing, who was champion at the coronation of James I⁶, was sentenced to prison and £1000 fine in 1610, for being privy to a stage play, given on a Sunday, on the Maypole green, libelling the Earl of Lincoln⁷, and offending further by a postlude in the form of a burlesque preaching.

¹ *Anatomy of Melancholy*, London: Bell, 1904, Vol. III, p. 88.

² *Much Ado*, Act III, Sc. ii, 33 ff.

³ Louise Labé Perrin, *De folie et d’amour* (1555), Paris, 1875. ‘Discours,’ v, p. 47.

⁴ *Anatomy of Melancholy*, Vol. III, p. 202.

⁵ *Elizabethan Stage*, I, p. 328, citing Gildersleeve, *Government Regulation of Elizabethan Drama*, p. 108, based on Hist. MSS. Com. III, p. 57.

⁶ *D.N.B.*, under Sir John Dymoke. For various other offices, see Members of Parl.; also Acts Pr. Council, and S. P. Dom., indices for 1585 ff.

⁷ Henry Clinton, Dymock’s half-uncle (*Landed Gentry*), a man steadily in mean broils: *Acts Pr. Council*, 1585–1615, *passim*; Manningham’s *Diary*, Camden Soc., p. 21; E. Lodge, *Illustrations of British History*, 1791, II, p. 380, III, pp. 108 ff.; Brydges, *Memoirs of the Peers*, pp. 43 ff.; R. Davies, *Greatest House at Chelsey*, pp. 47 ff.; *Cal. Salisbury MSS.*, x, pp. 146, 401, XI, pp. 184, 189 etc.

Crime and punishment were alike heavy. But before assuming that only the gravity of the affair brought it from Lincolnshire to Westminster, and that the decree was determined simply by the seriousness of the affair, it is necessary to notice the turbulent history of the Lincoln-Dymock factions, extending at least from 1589 to the year of this play. Although I have found no Star Chamber papers relating to this particular case, yet the indices of that court for the reigns of Elizabeth and James record some forty documents¹, at least, with Lincoln as plaintiff, and Sir Edward as defendant, or some one of his allies: Ascough, Armyne, Bawtry, Savyll. The quarrel (involving assault, poundbreak, packed jury, and the like) is described in letters from the Earl to Burleigh²: these men have long practised to endanger his life, to kill his servants, and to raise others to envious libel against him, under colour of friendship; the 'vsuall Course of sclaunders, by base, and lewde persones, impudente women, and Scoldes,' is maintained by his 'aunciente enymies,...whoe being many, are all putt into the comission of the peace'; they are grown so great, 'by the authorite and Creditte, of being depute lewetenanntes to your L.p., that I cann hope for noe Justice nor indifferencye.'

The quarrel evidently tried the patience of the Lords of the Council, as the records of 1600³, for instance, show. In 1607, Cecil wrote a sharp rebuke⁴ to the wrangling earl: 'bring me the man,' he says, 'that had ever power to persuade you to do anything but for your own lucre,' and that man will be rewarded. He asks Lincoln to forbear his stories, and his 'dribbling controversies,' and ends, 'wishing you a quiet heart, which you will never have, I fear me.' In this fear he was apparently fully justified.

Whether or not this ugly and prolonged quarrel would prove worth following out for the family and county history that it contains⁵, it deserves notice here as suggesting that the decree of 1610 cannot be explained merely as severity against libellous and Sabbath-breaking drama. A hearing in the Star Chamber is seen to be quite customary in

¹ A few of these are indexed under Dymock or Ascough; for 1603 and later see Star Ch. Proc. Jas. I, 91/16 ff. See also S. P. Dom. Eliz. cclvii, 10.

² Harl. MS. 6996, f. 224; Lansd. MS. 84, f. 143 (1594, 1597). See S. P. Dom. Eliz. cclv, 18; Salisbury MSS., Hatfield House, 100, 10 and 126, 82.

³ Acts Pr. Council, N.S. xxx, index under Lincoln; the earl is sent to the Fleet.

⁴ Salisbury MSS., Hatfield House, 193, 100 and 197, 82 (two versions).

⁵ It is possible that Churchyard had this controversy in mind when he dedicated to Dymock his 'Discourse of true Manhoode,' published in his *Challenge*, 1593. He wrote it, he says, especially for Dymock, as 'a little peece of the nature of a quarrell,' choosing that subject because of the many quarrels the knight had seen or heard of on his travels, and taking several occasions to commend the wise man who keeps a 'bridled mind' when brought into 'some quarrelous brabble.'

this Lincolnshire warfare; and the heaviness of the penalty is doubtless due in part to the weariness and exasperation of the Lords after twenty-one years of this 'dribbling controversy.'

HELEN E. SANDISON.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y., U.S.A.

THE INFLUENCE OF RONSARD

In the recent work of M. Marcel Raymond, *L'influence de Ronsard sur la poésie française (1550-1585)* (Paris, 1927), there is a slight tendency to exaggerate Ronsard's influence.

Vol. I, p. 74. The sonnet by Pontus de Tyard, 'Au lecteur,' quoted by M. Raymond on this page, is derived from the Latin satirist, Persius, and probably owes nothing at all to Ronsard. The theme is very common in the sixteenth century, occurring in English¹ as well as in French. Ronsard's poem on the subject (*Amours*, I, 85) is probably also a direct imitation of Persius' Prologue.

Vol. I, p. 242. The first sonnet of M.-Claude de Buttet's *Amalthée*, quoted by M. Raymond on this page, is another version of the same theme. The place occupied by this sonnet in de Buttet's sequence suggests at once Persius and Tyard, and perhaps also Du Bellay, *Regrets*, II², rather than Ronsard.

Vol. II, p. 91. Desportes' sonnet, quoted here by M. Raymond, is a very close imitation of a sonnet of Petrarch's. Desportes' sonnet begins:

A pas lents et tardifs tout seul je me promaine

and ends:

Mais j'ai beau me cacher, je ne puis me sauver
En désert si sauvage, ou si basse vallée,
Qu'Amour ne me découvre, et me vienne trouver.

(*Amours d'Hipp.* XLV.)

This is of course a French version of the well-known Petrarchan:

Solo e pensoso i più deserti campi
vo misurando....

Ma pur sì aspre vie nè sì selvagge
cercar non so, ch'Amor non venga sempre
ragionando con meco, ed io con lui.

Ronsard himself sought inspiration in Petrarch, but Desportes did not go to Ronsard but went directly to the lover of Laura.

JANET G. SCOTT.

GLASGOW.

¹ Sidney, *Astrophel and Stella*, LXXIV.

² Cp. M. Chamard's edition of the *Regrets*.

THE SOURCE OF ACHIM VON ARNIM'S 'OWEN TUDOR'

Achim von Arnim's *Wintergarten*, published in 1809, contains among other stories that of Owen Tudor, the page who ultimately becomes the husband of his queen. This story, which Arnim himself called 'eine Reisegeschichte,' was the outcome of a journey through England and Wales in 1803. It is generally assumed¹—following Arnim's own statement—that it was told him on the way by a travelling companion. As a matter of fact, Arnim had with him a book which had just appeared, *Remarks upon North Wales*, by W. Hutton (Birmingham, 1803); in a foot-note concerning the religious sect of the 'Jumpers' he himself directs his readers' attention to this book. Here he found an account of Owen Tudor. The story, the local colouring and many details are taken over from Hutton; the description of Owen's birthplace, Penmynidd, the list of Owen's descendants, the references to his ancestors are literally copied. But Arnim is romantically careless in his appropriation of proper names: St Beuno becomes the more plausible Benno, place-names are often used as Christian names. Even quite trivial phrases and remarks of Hutton's find an echo; thus Arnim tells us that Penmynidd was more fertile in growing kings than grass, and he repeats word for word the whimsical answer which Owen's mother makes to the queen's messenger. Arnim's own contributions to the story, which at the same time throw light on his methods as a historical novelist, are his framework, the interweaving of the topical with historical happenings, and his romantic atmosphere, the latter being conspicuous in his charming elaboration of the early love-story of the queen and her page. In all these things Arnim shows himself a forerunner of Sir Walter Scott. Motives are introduced, too, from the German 'Märchen,' as when Owen fetches the queen's ring from the water (*Der Froschkönig*). Arnim does not follow Hutton's story to its tragic close: after nine years of married life, Owen lost his queen and protector and found a sad, if picturesque end on the scaffold in Hereford marketplace; he prefers to give it the happy ending of a fairy-tale.

KATHERINE JONES.

LONDON.

¹ R. Steig and H. Grimm, *Achim von Arnim und die ihm nahestanden*, 1, Stuttgart, 1894, p. 103.

REVIEWS

Chaucer, The Nun's Priest's Tale. Edited by KENNETH SISAM. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1927. xlv + 81 pp. 1s. 6d.

This is an excellent edition. The editor's introduction detects early analogues of Marie de France's fable of the cock and the fox in Alcuin, Adhemar, and in the twelfth-century Latin poem *Gallus et Vulpes*. It gives a joyous glimpse of the *Roman de Renart* and an account of the instructive adventure of Reynard with Chantecler, which is illustrated with quaint pictures from MS. Douce 360. A closely reasoned section on Chaucer's treatment of the fable admirably discusses the relationship of the *Nun's Priest's Tale* to the *Roman* and Chaucer's amplification of the story. The notes are full and unusually explanatory, and the editor wisely manages to discuss astrology, botany and dreams without special appendices. The note on *herbe-yve* (200) is as short and to the point, however, as that on *As seith my lord* (679) is discursive and inconclusive. One may perhaps mention as a matter of interest that an idiom of the type of *these clerkes* (34), meaning learned men in general, is still in use, at least in Yorkshire. There is an excellent appendix on Chaucer's English. The Note on the Metre makes no mention of the 'weak cæsura,' which would solve the scansion of l. 276:

And in this cårte heere || he lîth gapyng upright.

In the Glossary a laudable attempt has been made 'to distinguish the many slight changes of meaning that have occurred since Chaucer's time'—a matter which is also discussed on p. 61.

This text of the *Nun's Priest's Tale* is based on the Ellesmere facsimile, with emendations; and the spelling of the original is closely followed. The editor has deftly restored the text in ll. 89, 116, 161, 218, 270, 276, 318, 327, 340, 426, 587, *620, and 662. Possibly his emendations in ll. 88 (any), 124 (O om.), 548 (For), 642 (sholde) are correct, but I prefer the reading of the Ellesmere MS. I query his scansion of *haddè* in ll. 33 and 64, of *sovereynly* in l. 596, and there appears to be a misprint in l. 175. Lastly, I should prefer *th' equymozial* l. 90, *lovede* 110 (= lov'd(e) not loved), *ypassed* 423 (cf. *ylogged* 225, *ygon* 652), *nadde* 584 (cf. N'apoplexie 75) and *yolledén* 623. But one suggests these with fitting deference, because one recognises the care with which the text has been prepared. The sixth forms of the next few years will owe many interesting hours to Mr Sisam.

G. H. COWLING.

LEEDS.

Chaucer and the Rhetoricians. By Professor J. M. MANLY (Warton Lecture No. XVII). London: H. Milford. 1927. 21 pp. 1s.

That Dan Chaucer was a 'verray parfit praktisour' of the art of

rhetoric was a fact well recognised in the sixteenth century. Dunbar admitted it:

O reverend Chauser, ross of rethouris all,
As in our tounge ane flour imperiall.

And did not Leland describe him as *dulcis rhetor, lepidus poeta*, whose high style rivalled the Italian of Petrarch? But modern scholars have overlooked this important formative influence, says Professor Manly, and 'the possibility of his acquaintance with formal rhetorical theory and the precepts of rhetoricians has not been considered,' though Chaucer alluded to Geoffrey de Vinsauf in the *Nun's Priest's Tale*, and indeed, his schooling must have included the study of rhetoric.

In this lecture before the British Academy which he describes as a 'first sketch of an unwritten chapter in the development of one of England's greatest poets,' Professor Manly states that Chaucer was a student of mediæval rhetoric, which was based upon Cornificius' *ad Herennium*, Cicero's *de Inventione*, and Horace's *Ars Poetica*; and the text-books of which were Matthieu de Vendôme's *Ars Versificatoria*, and Geoffrey de Vinsauf's *Documentum de Arte Versificandi* and *Nova Poetria*. In illustration of this fact he urges, if I understand him aright, that Chaucer's proems were rhetorical prefaces elaborated from *sententiae* and *exempla*, and that Chaucer's early descriptions of characters were based on rhetorical models, that of Blanche the Duchess being 'nothing more than a free paraphrase of ll. 563-597 of the *Nova Poetria* composed by Gaufred de Vinsauf as a model for the description of a beautiful woman.'

But Professor Manly also urges, and this is more doubtful, that Chaucer's development was 'a process of gradual release from the astonishingly artificial and sophisticated art with which he began, and the gradual replacement of formal rhetorical devices by methods of composition based upon close observation of life and the exercise of the creative imagination.' That Chaucer used colours and figures is an important fact, and we are grateful to Professor Manly for illustrating it. To accept all his implications, however, would be to deprive him of the pleasure of developing his thesis more fully. We await with eager expectation his *amplificatio* with *exempla*. Having whetted our appetites, he can hardly plead *dubitatio*; and to urge *occupatio* would be to work overtime at idleness.

G. H. COWLING.

LEEDS.

A Study of the M.E. Poem known as the Southern Passion. By BEATRICE DAW BROWN (Bryn Mawr College Dissertation). Oxford: University Press. 1926. 111 pp.

This book is an introduction to an edition of the text to be published by the Early English Text Society. 'The term "Southern Passion" designates the narrative poem dealing with the Passion, Resurrection and Ascension which is incorporated in numerous MSS. of the *South English Legendary*.' Such is the definition of her subject given by the

authoress. The *Southern Passion* was written, she thinks, for inclusion in the *Legendary*; both were probably composed 1275-85. Mrs Brown discusses the MSS., their provenience and dialect, the sources of the poem; and the probable connexion of the *South English Legendary* with the Dominicans.

The principal sources are shown to be the Vulgate, Comestor, S. Bernard, S. Hugh of S. Victor, the *Meditationes Vitae Christi*, and the *Lignum Vitae* of S. Bonaventura. Evidence is produced to make it probable that the *Meditationes* is a work of the thirteenth century. The *South English Legendary*, Mrs Brown thinks, is not merely not by Robert of Gloucester, but rather a Somerset than a Gloucester work. Her discussion of the dialects of the several MSS. is interesting, and should be read in connexion with Miss Serjeantson's *Distribution of Dialectal Characteristics in M.E.* (1924) and her articles in the *Rev. of Engl. Studies*, III (1927), pp. 54 ff., 186 ff. and 319 ff. on 'The Dialects of the West Midlands.' Miss Serjeantson deals with several dialectal features not mentioned by Mrs Brown; and I select for discussion the treatment of O.E. *ĕa*-*i*, because it is a difficult but important problem which is only now receiving proper attention. In 1924, Miss Serjeantson deals mainly with place-name material; in 1927, primarily with literary evidence¹. In 1924, she says that Somerset, and perhaps Gloucestershire after the ninth century, have *īe* < *ĕa*-*i*; and that Robert of Gloucester shows no *i*-forms, but usually has *e*, and sometimes *u*. In 1927, she says that the S.W. Midland dialects (including Gloucester) were probably distinguished from the S. Western by a more sparing use of *ū* < *ĕa*-*i*. On p. 196, *Rev. of Engl. Studies*, III, she says: 'Robt. of Glos. (early fourteenth century) has *u* in *hure* "hear" (rhymes with A.N. *dure* = "to last" etc.), *hurde*, etc., but *e* in *derne*, *yflemd*, *leue*, etc.' I find² *ihure* (inf.) rhyming seven times with *Arþure* (2815, 3758, 3851, 3931, 4149, 4157, 9902); and also with *dure* (vb.) (8320 and 8542), and *fure* = 'fire'; but in 10446 *bileued* (pp.), r. w. *heued* = 'head,' and 2756 and 1762 *nede* (adv. and sb.) r. w. *lede* < *lædan* and *bede* < *bēodan*. In *S.E.L.*, the vb. *ihuyre* usually rhymes with O.F. -*u*-words, or *fuyre* (sb.); but often with *e*-words: e.g. *Francis* 338 *ihere* : *manere*; *Becket* 5 *ihere* : *were* (3s. pr. su.); and 77 *fere* (sb.); *ib.* 1053 *afuyre* : *i-huyre* (cf. *Patr. Purg.* 203); *Brendan* 484 *heore* : *afuyre*; *Mary Eg.* 21 *huyre* : *creature*, and 39 *schiphuyre*; *ib.* 139 *derne* : *huyrne* (sb.); *Michael* 497 *ileue* (subj.); *Eue* (pr. n.); 531 *afuyre* : *ihuyre*; *Ph. and Jas.* 11 *misaudenture* : *i-huyre*; *Edm. Cfr.* 7 *manere* : *i-here*; *M. Magd.* 205 *fere* (sb.) : *i-here* (inf.). In both Robert of Gloucester and the *South English Legendary* -*u*- seems usual before *r*, but not elsewhere. *Ferumbras* (which Jordan gives to Devonshire) has several -*u*- spellings, but the sound seems rather to be -*e*-: e.g. 112

¹ Robert of Gloucester Miss Serjeantson treats as a Gloucestershire text; the *South English Legendary* as perhaps from Malmesbury. Of it she says that in the treatment of [*ĕa*-*i*] it is more like Trevisa than Robert of Gloucester.

² References: for Robert of Gloucester to MS. Cott. Calig. A. xi as printed by Wright, as his 'A' text, in the Rolls Series; for the *South English Legendary* and *Ferumbras*, to the E.E.T.S. editions.

yhurde : *furde* = 'behaved'; 770 *yherd* (pp.) : *swerd* = 'sword'; 2565 *yhere* (inf.) : *yfere* = 'together'; 2874 *here* (inf.) : *here* (adv.); 4728 *here* : *were* (3s. pt. su.); 84 *berde* (sb.) : *ferde* = 'host,' and so in 94-5, but the second word is spelt *furde*; 894 *furde* = 'behaved' : *swerde* (sb.); 936 *berde* : *ferde* = 'host'; and so on.

Another interesting comparison which can be made between Robert of Gloucester and the *South English Legendary* is concerned with Scandinavian loan-words¹. The rough result of such a comparison is:

South English Legendary (MS. Laud 108), c. 17200 lines: c. 100 possible loan-words, of which 30 were either borrowed in the O.E. period, or were really native words; and only 9 words in common use were added in the M.E. period.

Robert of Gloucester (Wright's 'A' MS.), c. 12000 lines: c. 73 loan-words, of which 28 are used in O.E., and only 6 in common use added in M.E.

The distribution of Scandinavian loan-words in Layamon's *Brut* and *Ferumbras* seems to be much the same.

About 40 loan-words are common to Robert of Gloucester and the *South English Legendary*, of which *Boske* sb., *Gōme* sb., *Kippen* = 'grip, snap up,' *Mone* = 'remembrance,' *Skēren* vb., *Tīþinge* = 'tidings,' are noteworthy. *Gōme* occurs also in *Ferumbras*. 18 possible loan-words are common to Robert of Gloucester, *South English Legendary* and *Layamon* (A + B): *Bonde*, *Bōþe*, *Bule*, *Cart*, *Casten*, *Deizen*, *Greīþen*, *Hail*, *Husbonde*, *Lawe* sb., *Lōwe* a., *Leg*, *Marc* (coin), *Slēh* a., *Swein*, *Trusten* (-i-, -e-), *Pral*, *Wōn*, *wān* sb., *Weng-*, *Wrong* (-a). Of these, all occur in *Ferumbras*, except *Bonde*, *Bule*, *Marc*, *Swein*, *pral*, *Weng*.

In all investigations of the dialect of the *South English Legendary* and Robert of Gloucester, each MS., and each legend, must be studied separately, as Mrs Brown implies on p. 10, and has done so far as her plan made it necessary to do so.

I think that (p. 96, n. 9) Horstmann's *poudre* is probably right: cf. *Ancrene Wisse* (in Hall's *Early Middle English*) A. l. 81.

I look forward to the E.E.T.S. volume to which the present work is so interesting an introduction.

CYRIL BRETT.

CARDIFF.

Sir Gawain and the Green Knight. Edited by J. R. R. TOLKIEN and E. V. GORDON. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1925. xxi + 211 pp. 7s. 6d.

Clearness, conciseness, scholarship, and common-sense are the marks of this edition. The editors concern themselves principally with the establishment of the text, and the interpretation of its words. In the text, they are wisely conservative; the changes which they make are

¹ Björkman's *Scdn. Loan-words in M.E.* (1900-2) is used as the basis of these remarks. I may say that I have been for some time investigating the use and distribution of Scandinavian loan-words in O.E. and M.E., and hope soon to publish some remarks upon them.

commonly in punctuation, and nearly always make the sense more easy to follow (e.g. 322, 411-12, 516, 845, 1284, 1304, 1580, 1623 ff., 1953 ff., 2025-9, 2383). Their interpretations are always sensible, and often convincing. They give an admirable sketch of the metre and language of the poem. The glossary nobly attempts the hard task of finding idiomatic and contextual renderings. The size of the book was, I believe, strictly limited by the University Press authorities, and this partly accounts for a feature of the edition, which has already been publicly criticised. I have here a privilege to speak; for, of the suggestions contributed by me to the *Modern Language Review*, and appearing in this edition, only one is acknowledged. One of the editors courteously told me that he and his colleague had carefully considered all my published notes. I do not speak ironically, when I say that only lack of space and time prevented the editors from making due acknowledgement wherever they were sensible of a debt. Many notions, I doubt not, occurred to them before they had seen them in the writings of others. It is not necessary that I should praise this admirable work in detail; everyone who uses it will do so with joy and profit¹. But it is perhaps worth while to point out those places where, I believe, the book may be improved, in a second edition.

p. viii. The scribbles in the margin of the MS. might be mentioned together:

F. 95 b. *Hugo de* (cf. p. xvii, n. 2). F. 128 b. *Hony soyt q̄ mal penc*. In a fifteenth-century hand.

F. 129. *Mi minde*... (cf. p. viii). In a hand contemporary with, and perhaps in the same hand as, that of the rest of the MS.

F. 111 b [= 115 b]. Right-hand margin [opp. l. 1535 in the printed text] ? *Romeson* (a mere scribble).

F. 111 b. In the left-hand margin [opp. 1544-5]...[? o] *ton*, in a contemporary or later hand.

[The palæographical statements above are made on the information of Mr J. P. Gilson, kindly given to me in 1915.]

p. ix. The lady did not kiss Gawayn *thrice* at each visit. At the first (1306) she kissed him once; at the second (1505, 1535) twice; at the third (1758, 1796, 1868-9) *thrice*.

p. xii n. The editors might have pondered their own words about Bledfri before they accepted Kittredge's theory of an immediate French source. Bledfri existed, though we may not have any of his works. I see no reason to suppose an A.F. or O.F. original for *Gawayn*. Kittredge's brilliance and ingenuity, his assumption of such an original, and subsequent talk of it as a fact, have led our editors too far. Everyone must agree with them, when they say that some features of the poem 'belong to French tradition' (p. xiii); that the influence of French idiom is traceable; that the correspondence with French analogues is often detailed; but these facts do not justify the assumption of a French original, in any proper sense of that word. The disagreement of the editors with Kittredge in a fundamental point (p. xvi, n. 4) is significant.

¹ *Gaw. 1007-9 changing me to 3ow.*

(ll. 31, 690, 2521-3 need be no more than a conventional and general reference to well-known Arthurian stories.)

p. xx. The author knew particularly well the *Roman de Lancelot* and the *Suite de Merlin*.

p. xxi, l. 3. The editors should have given the evidence on which they rely for their remark upon *sabatoun*. To the ordinary reader, they seem mistaken. They include among the details indicating for the poem a late fourteenth-century date, 'the square-toed *sabatoun* worn by Gawain, 574'; and in their note on 574, they say: 'the *sabatoun* were not much used in England before the end of [the fourteenth] century, though the term was used by Robert of Brunne about 1330 in his translation of Wace's *Brut* (Rolls ed., i. 10026¹) to render *cauces de fer*; but this is hardly evidence that they were worn in England in his time. The usual protection for the foot then worn by knights was the pointed *solleret*.' Here are several statements and implications: (a) *sabatoun* means a square-toed steel shoe, (b) *solleret* means a pointed steel shoe, and is therefore different from *sabatoun*; (c) square-toed steel shoes were worn in England in the latter part of the fourteenth century, (d) and perhaps in France much earlier, to judge from Robert of Brunne (?).

As to (a): the ancestor of *sabatoun* seems to have been a Spanish word for a shoe, which spread from Spain, southwards to Moors and Berbers, eastwards to Italy, northwards to Provence and Gascony, and perhaps later to all France. Its ordinary meaning in France and Italy has been and is, an old worn shoe, especially one with a down-trodden heel, or without 'upper' at the heel (hence perhaps the application to the early plate half-sollerets, covering only the front and upper part of the foot). The word still exists in Provence, as *sabatoun* = 'shoe,' as Basque *zapata*, as French *savate* (and possibly *sabot*). Robert of Brunne translates by a word which he knew² as meaning a steel foot-covering, the *cauces de fer* of Wace. The whole of Robert's description of Arthur's armour is adapted to the armour of his own day. As for the other passages quoted in the *N.E.D.*, those from Lydgate and Metham (c. 1430 and c. 1450 respectively) show the word used of armour; so does that from Grafton (1543); that of 1485 speaks of 'sabatons of cloth of golde'; and to these might be added the following: the mid-fifteenth-century document printed in *Archæologia*, LVII, pp. 29 ff., esp. p. 43 (ff. 122 b-123 b), *How a man schal be armyd at his ese...* 'firste ye muste sette on Sabatones & tye them on the shoo with smale poyntes that wol [not?] breke....' (Cf. froulkes' comments, pp. 62 and 73 of his *Armour and Weapons* (1909).) I have neither Scott's edition of *Sir Tristrem* nor Lydgate's *Troy Book* at hand, but it seems probable that the lines quoted in Planché's *Cyclopædia of Costume* (1876), I, p. 517 from *Clariodes*, and including 'sabatynes' in a list of armour, are from Lydgate (cf. *Anglia*, xvi, p. 396). The last *N.E.D.* quotation, from

¹ (Misprinted 'Rolls, ed. i, 19026.')

² Perhaps from our connexion with Gascony. Gascons may have spoken scornfully of the new (c. 1320) steel foot-defences, as 'sabatouns' or 'old shoes,' and the name was taken up by the English. I have not seen the word, used of armour, except in English.

Boutell, 1869, shows how what I believe to be the current mistake arose. 'At the commencement of the sixteenth century, the pointed sollerets were succeeded by broad sabbatons, cut off square or rounded at the toes.' Boutell is right in general, but why does he speak of the new-fashioned shoes as 'sabbatons' as distinct from 'sollerets'? Perhaps for two reasons: (i) because of such passages as that of 1543, which uses 'sabbatons,' and belongs to the broad-toed period; (ii) because of the great authority of Meyrick, the pioneer in armour studies: see *A Critical Enquiry into Ancient Armour* (2nd ed. 1842), II, p. 157, n. 6: 'Wide coverings for the shoes,' etc. (Cf. Planché, *op. cit.*, I, p. 439 s.v. *Sabatynes* and Meyrick, *op. cit.*, III, Glossary s.v.: 'Steel clogs were so called that were put on the shoes instead of sollerets. They are spoken of in the time of Henry VI [i.e. in the passage quoted above from *Archæologia*?], and may be seen in the Triumph of Maximilian I, Emperor of Germany. He then quotes 'sabaton' from 'Lydgate's *Thebes*'¹.)

As to (b): the differentiation of *solleret* from *sabaton* seems due to modern archæologists, e.g. Meyrick and Boutell. Neither Hewitt (*Anct. Armour*, 1855-60), nor Laking (*European Arms and Armour*, 1920), seems to use the word *sabaton*; both use *solleret* for a steel shoe of any shape.

As to (c): I know no evidence that 'square-toed steel shoes' were worn in England till the last years of the fifteenth century, and they do not seem to have been common anywhere in Europe till 1500 or 1510. Cf. Laking, *op. cit.*, III, p. 243: 'No document of the end of the fifteenth century is known in which the Maximilian type of armour is described. It is therefore probable, that after a short transitional period, this style of armour was introduced about 1510. It is distinguished by... sollerets with broad toe-caps....'

As to (d): *cauces de fer*, in Wace's time, in France or England, were mail protections for leg and foot, and were not always worn, but when worn, naturally took more or less the natural shape of the leg and foot. In Robert's time, foot-coverings were either of mail, or of mail covered on the upper part of the foot with steel plates, of which the toe-cap was pointed.

In short, from the statements of Meyrick and his followers, the following wrong deductions seem to have been made: '*sabatouns* = broad or square-toed steel shoes; therefore, wherever the word occurs, such a kind of shoe is meant; the word occurs in M.E. of the fourteenth century; therefore square-toed steel shoes were worn in England in that century.'

Finally, in our MS. pictures, Gawain seems to wear pointed sollerets. p. xxviii. I hope that other editors of M.E. verse texts will remember

¹ In *Archæologia*, XVII, 295, Douce printed a text from a Lansdowne MS. In *Archæologia*, XX, 496, Meyrick explained this text, illustrating his comment by a composite drawing, in which the sabatons are taken from 'plate L in the Triumph of Maximilian,' and are therefore broad-toed. In *Archæologia*, LVII, 29, Dillon printed a similar text from a Hastings MS., and reproduces the MS. pictures. His plate VII (f. 122 b of MS.) shows the knight being armed; he wears long pointed sollerets!

what Tolkien and Gordon say, and imitate them. They have not often turned from their path; but there is no need to change the MS. reading in 236, 881, 958, 1700, 1755, or 1941.

Before speaking of places in the poem, I must say that when I quote the late Professor Napier, without reference, I mean my notes of his Oxford lectures. I may, therefore, at any moment, reveal my own stupidity and be unjust to that great scholar. It is not the least of the gifts of this edition, that it tells us, authoritatively (p. vi), Napier's views.

46. *glaum ande gle*. All that can be said against *ande* is that in *Gawain* the conjunction is not so spelt [unless here and in 1426], except it begin a line—commonly a stanza. In 1426 there is less to be said for reading *glauer ande*, as the editors imply in their glossary; cf. *Morte Arthur* (ed. Björkman), 2538: 'siche glauerande gomes.' (See *N.E.D.* and *Engl. Studien*, XLVII, p. 316.)

67 ff. Grattan's note in *Rev. of Engl. Studies*, I, p. 486, is strange: though an embrace may include a kiss, it is surely awkward to give a kiss 'by hand'; and if these words be translated 'in person,' to kiss by proxy is so dull a business as hardly to be here implied as an alternative. Onions, *Notes and Queries*, 1924, would refer 'the loss' of 69 to kisses; this suggestion goes well enough with the evident opposition of *Ladies* and *He þat*. Perhaps some game like 'Ragman' is indicated; or we may think of some such practice as the following: 'Que omnia falsa sunt et uana et superstitiosa. Et idem patet de illis qui credunt in primis donis, a^e. zers zeuys et hansels, per que credunt melius i peius expedire in die et ebdomada, mense et anno.' (*De Sortilegiis contra Fidem*, in the fourteenth-century *Fasciculus Morum*, pp. 228 ff. of Little's *Studies in English Franciscan History* (1917).) This place also contains a reference 'de Rageman et festucis (con)trahendis.' Cf. also Gower's use of *hansel* in *C.A.*, v, 7160 and context.

113. *hymseluen*. This may be one of the places where it seems well to take *hym* as plural: e.g. 229, *hym* more naturally refers to *y3e* (Napier cj. *hem*, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xvii); 49, *hym* might refer to Arthur, or to 'lordez & ladies'; 493, *hym* more naturally refers to *þay* of the same sentence, than to the king of the last; 1423, *hym* more naturally refers to the hounds than reflexively to the hunter; 1684, *hym* surely is G. and the lord; 1897, *hym* might be either plural reflexive or the object of *hasted*; 2491, 'þe grete' and 'hym' are probably plural; the reference being to king and court. Finally in *Purity*, 843, *hym* is clearly plural.

160. I prefer my interpretation of *scholes* as leather (?) pieces under the legs, as in riding-breeches: see *Mod. Lang. Review*, x, p. 189. 'Shoes' are surely not 'under shanks where the man rides.'

186. *Capados*. This may be a tunic of Cappadocian leather; so Napier, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xv, p. 11; but G. W. Hamilton, *Mod. Phil.*, v, pp. 365 ff. (Jan. 1908), gives good reasons for returning to Madden's rendering, 'hood' or close cap coming low on the neck.

197-9. I would punctuate: 'er þat tyme. | With y3e | He loked as layt so lyzt...': this rids us of the tautology of 'with syzt' and 'with

ye'; and is besides more naturally said of a man's eyes or glance, than of his whole appearance.

211. *grayn*. Perhaps rather a spike or projection at the back of the axe: see *Mod. Lang. Review*, x, p. 189.

235. *Growe*, as infinitive is surely natural enough? (See *Rev. of Engl. Studies*, I, p. 486.)

296. *barlay*. Does this not rather mean: '(when it is) my turn'? It is too early for the author to talk of 'no resistance'; and this is implied in the Green Knight's terms. Cf. J. Paterson, *Story of Stephen Compton* (1913), p. 10: 'Barley me' to Burnley children = 'I'm first,' 'This is mine,' 'My turn next or now,' 'wait a bit,' 'give me time.'

350. Why not punctuate: '...talentyf, to take...'? when 'to take hit' depends on 'me pink hit not semly,' and the construction is not broken off, and is easier to follow.

372. *on kyrf*. Surely this is *ōn k.*, = 'one blow, cut'? which has been twice specially mentioned by the Green Knight. The king is repeating the conditions of the 'game.'

477. Cf. *Mod. Lang. Review*, xiv (1919), p. 7.

790. *Enbaned*. If we had only this passage and *Purity*, 1458-9 to guide us, we should naturally conclude that the 'enbaned' part of the wall¹ was just under the battlements, and closely connected with the *tablez* or projecting cornice-mouldings. The quotations in Levy's *Provenzalisches Supplement. Wörterbuch*, ii, s.vv. *Enbanamen*, -*anar*, etc., and in Du Cange, s.vv. *ambanare*, *invannare*, etc., are not clear or precise; but generally the word is connected with a tower, or with some special fortification of the walls. I suggest that it is used of the machicolations, which are under the battlements, closely connected with the corbel-tables. (Cf. Levy's quotation from Thomas, *An. du Midi*, v, p. 505: where *embanar* is translated 'munir d'un parapet.') Skeat suggested, because O.F. *bane*, Prov. *bana* = 'horn,' that 'hornwork' was implied in *enbaned*, but this seems improper, because hornwork is no more 'under the battlement' than any other part of the defences—rather less, in fact, as it projects from the main building. As Gawain looks at the castle, his eyes move from the water up and up to the top of the wall. A. Hamilton Thompson, *Military Architecture in England* (1912), p. 323, has a picture of Bodiam Castle which looks much like the description of Bercilak's; and on the same page, one of Hurstmonceaux gatehouse; both pictures show machicolations, and the tables and their supports may fancifully be likened to rams' horns curving downwards.

864. Cf. *Mod. Lang. Review*, xix (1924), p. 205.

967. 'Bay...could only mean bay-coloured.' Cf. *Mod. Lang. Review*, viii, p. 162; *Rev. of Engl. Studies*, I, p. 485.

975. Cf. *Midsummer Night's Dream*, III, i, 184, 'I shall desire you of more acquaintance, good master Cobweb.'

1053. Should we read *not* for MS. *wot*, rather than *ne wot*?

1239-40. Cf. *Mod. Lang. Review*, x, pp. 191 ff.

¹ For it is not the building as a whole, which is spoken of as *enbaned*; it is probably the wall (787); or possibly the 'tablez' (789).

1265-6. Cf. *Mod. Lang. Review*, xix (1924), pp. 206-8; *Rev. of Engl. Studies*, i, p. 487.

1377. *Tayles*: gl. 'tallies': why not 'tails'? 'Tallies' commonly, though not always, has -ll-.

1395-7. A better punctuation would be: '...no more; For...tyde3; trawe 3e non oþer | 3e mowe.'

1406. I agree with the editors' note; but it is worth while referring to Morsbach, *Originalurkunden*, etc. (1923), p. 36, where, in a document of 1450, 'writ' appears as *Ŵrit*.

1431. *Knot*. I think Mrs Wright, *Engl. Studien*, xxxvi, gave the right interpretation: a mound or heap of boulders, etc., fallen from the face of the cliff, and overgrown with bushes, in which the boar has his lair.

1457 ff. A better punctuation would be: 'þa3...pece3, þe hede...hitte.' So hard does the arrow strike the boar, that the shaft splinters upon, and the steel head springs back from, the impenetrable brawn.

1497. *Devaye*. Cf. *Mod. Lang. Review*, x, p. 194.

1570. *rasse*: gl. 'level; (?) smooth bank, 1570. Cf. *Purity*, 446. [O.F. *ras*.] Napier suggested 'terrace,' 'ledge of rock.'

1595. I agree with Grattan in *Rev. of Engl. Studies*, i, p. 486.

1726. *Titleres*: why not 'tattlers,' talkers? (so Napier). Cf. *Piers Plowman*, B. xx, 297: 'taletellers & tyterers in ydel' [v.l. *titeleris*, Wright]: or, as Grattan, l.c., 'entitlers'?

1730. Cf. *Mod. Lang. Review*, viii, p. 163.

1755. It is not necessary to insert 'com,' if we take 'þat comly' of Gawain, and punctuate '...hast,'

1968. Napier took *dele* here as representing O.E. *zedælan* = 'receive (as one's share).'

1999. Is the rendering, 'comes up on the dark,' possible? I admit it is very plausible. Napier once took 'dryue3 to' as = 'to-dryue3': if this is possible we may compare Milton's *L'Allegro*: 'While the Cock with lively din, Scatters the rear of darknes thin.'

2012. Is *sadel* sb., as the glossary says? Why does Gawain want his saddle in his bed-room? How could Gringolet have been ready (2047) without it? Surely Gawain bids the chamberlain bring his clothes (and bid another) saddle his horse?

2079. Punctuate: '...þer-vnder Mist mused....'

2102. *Hestor*. Cf. Onions, *Notes and Queries* (1924). It may be said that H. was a very strong knight of his body, and one of the few who overthrew Gawain. He is often mentioned in the O.F. prose *Lancelot*.

2110. Cf. p. 131. *þe* may here be due to hurry and nervousness; in 2140 ff., it is perhaps part of the deliberate treatment of Gawain as a madman; while *fare3* in 2149 is perhaps the intrusion of involuntary respect, and custom.

2173. n. *for3*. Cf. the DB form Fossham, Yks, given by Lindkvist, *M.E. Place-Names of Scandinavian Origin*, i, p. 60, and n.

2316. *Spennefote*. Most long-jumpers are taught to keep their feet close together; but perhaps Gawain jumps sideways, not back.

2399. *at.* Cf. 1474, for the sense 'with'?

2418. *blended.* Cf. Gower, *Mirour*, 16693 ff.

2424. *Mused.* Cf. *Mod. Lang. Review*, xiv, p. 8.

2445 ff. I do not well understand the construction and sense of these lines, either with the old or new punctuation; with the old rendering of *maystres* as 'mistress,' or the new, as 'masteries, arts.'

A Berthelak (-lais, -aux) is concerned in the 'false Gonnore' business in the prose Merlin.

I hope the Oxford University Press will permit the inclusion, in a future edition, of at least the English parallel tales, e.g. the *Green Knight* ballad, *The Turk and Gowin*, *The Carle of Carlile*, etc.

CYRIL BRETT.

CARDIFF.

The Libelle of Englyshe Polycye. Edited by Sir GEORGE WARNER.
Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1926. lvi + 126 pp. 10s. 6d.

This remarkable fifteenth-century poem has long been known as the first conscious expression of the idea that England's greatness depended on the expansion of her trade, the development of her naval power and the mastery of the narrow seas. The edition generally quoted up to this has been Thomas Wright's in 1861, but need existed for a more critical text and this the late Keeper of MSS. in the British Museum has given us. He has collated as many as nine MSS. of the poem, and makes the interesting comment that one of these belonged to Pepys the diarist, another to Lord Burghley, and another (most probably) to Caxton the printer. Few poems of any age have had more influence. Sir George confirms the date of authorship as 1436, and whereas formerly the author was regarded as anonymous establishes, we think with finality, that the poem is the work of Adam Moleyns or Molyneux, Clerk of the Council. The important section devoted to Ireland (nearly a ninth part of the whole poem of 1200 lines) helps to establish the authorship. Moleyns was in 1436 recommended by the King to Rome for the archbishopric of Armagh on the expected resignation of John Swayne. He would thus be deeply interested in Ireland, and as Clerk of the Council would know of the many communications from the Irish government which urged the necessity of 'keeping Ireland that it be not lost' (such a communication, for instance, as is found in a letter from Swayne himself to the Lord Lieutenant, the Earl of Ormond, about 1427, in which the prelate states that the land obeying the King's laws in that country was now hardly as great as an English shire, an estimate referred to in the poem). Moleyns however did not get Armagh when it was vacated in 1439, an issue which Irish historians must regret, for his declared intention of devoting a special treatise to Ireland was in consequence never fulfilled.

The Libelle, though not remarkable as poetry, is excellent as a politico-economic tract; thus it tells us in detail the chief products and imports of England at the time. It is clearly also a plea to concentrate on insular

unity rather than foreign adventures, a plea taken to heart by the Yorkists as far as they could go, and with greater vigour and success by the Tudors. The re-conquest or recovery of Ireland for example is foreshadowed in it, and a student of Irish affairs will derive much light from it. The oft-quoted couplet:

God forebede that a wylde Yrishe wyrlinge
Shulde be chosene for to be there kyng

clearly expresses the haunting fear of that age that Ireland would cut herself adrift under some Earl of Desmond or Kildare or the O'Neill. We wonder however whether Sir George is correct in thinking that 'wyrlinge' is a dialectic word for 'a stunted, weakly, ill-grown person.' This derivation has the authority of the *New English Dictionary*, but may one question whether it is not rather 'warrior' or 'wild war-like person,' a derivative from 'werre,' often used in the poem? This would suit the reputation which the Irish had already won in English eyes.

The book is beautifully produced with some handsome plates, a masterly Introduction, and voluminous notes.

E. CURTIS.

DUBLIN.

The Meroure of Wyssdome, by Johannes de Irlandia, A.D. 1490. Edited by C. MACPHERSON. Vol. I. (The Scottish Text Society.) Edinburgh: W. Blackwood. 1926. xlvii + 233 pp.

This new volume in the series of the Scottish Text Society is a welcome addition to the slender ranks of mediæval English *Specula* available in print. Its author, John Irlande, tells us that 'it was compiled for the instruction of the most illustrious prince James IV, King of the Scots, and of his people,' and suggests in his *Exordium* that 'on the halyday ore ilk day of lentyrne, thi hieness may heire a chepture of jt' [p. 15]. However, it is entirely lacking in the quaint admixture of *Fisike* and *Fisnomye* that colours fifteenth-century English versions of that popular handbook for princes known as *Secreta Secretorum*, or in the interesting social allusions to be found in Hoccleve's metrical *Regement of Princes*. Its dull and commonplace array of theological arguments will dishearten all but the stoutest reader.

Mr Macpherson's Introduction is valuable for its painstaking and exhaustive sketch of the author and his literary output. We see him, Scotsman by birth, 'Doctor and Professor of the University of Paris, the familiar and adviser of two monarchs, an envoy on diplomatic missions many and delicate,' and a faithful son of the Church. But when the editor goes on to discuss the *Meroure* itself, he shows himself sadly unfamiliar with the literature of his subject. Professor Millar's fantastic description of the work as 'apparently an original piece of hortatory social philosophy' is quoted with approval; whereas it would be hard to find any touch of originality in this late fifteenth-century compilation. It is simply a typical mediæval exposition, in English, of the Lord's Prayer, Ave Maria, Creed, and Sacraments, with other equally common-

place theological matter interspersed, after the general pattern—let us say—of John Waldeby's Latin treatises compiled at York, a century earlier. The present volume of the text carries us as far as the exposition of the *Ave Maria*. This Mr Macpherson calls 'an erudite exposition of the *Magnificat*' (!) [p. xli], and further fails to realise that the concluding chapter of this section—on the significance of the holy name *Jesus* (which name, by the way, should have been printed in italics on pp. 3 and 160, to fit the rest)—is, of course, merely concerned with the last word of that famous orison¹. The 'allegorical interlude' of chapters ix and x, which presents 'the gret disputacioun betwix the foure heavenly wertuis, Mercy, Verite, Equite and Pes' in the presence of God, following an account of the Fall of Adam, should have been recognised as the familiar mediæval dramatic expansion of Psalm lxxxv, 10, popularised by Bishop Grossetête's *Chateau d'amour* in the thirteenth century.

For the rest, John Irland loads his sentences with the usual scriptural quotations, Latin tags, propositions of logic, formal Questions and Conclusions, all characteristic of the dreary scholastic exposition of his day. When he reminds us [p. 164], in the course of his argument, that 'Gowere, Chauceire' (whose metrical Prayer to the Virgin appears on pp. 166–70), 'the monk of Berry and mony wthire has writtin jn jnglis tonge richt wisly, jnduceand personis to lefe vicis and folow wertuis,' we are forced to sigh that the 'high matters of theology,' when handled, as in the present case, by a learned Master of that science, demanded that 'my langage be nocht in Ryme, nore plesand to part of pepil.'

G. R. OWST.

LONDON.

The First English Translations of the Classics. By C. H. CONLEY. New Haven, Conn.; Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1927. 158 pp. 13s. 6d.

In this well-turned out and well-printed book, Dr Conley uses the translations of the mid-sixteenth century as a means of illustrating the conflicting forces which, in the preparatory period of the Elizabethan Age, hindered or promoted the development of English literature. The different literary levels reached by the translators or the detailed characteristics of their work are not the author's concern. From the standpoint of this study the translations themselves are not so important as the aims and attitudes of the translators, expressed in their choice of subject and in their dedications and prefaces. Indeed, prefaces and dedications supply the bulk of the citations by which, with the patient 'listing' industry we have learnt to expect from American scholarship, Dr Conley supports his theses. The translators are presented as the champions of the Renaissance, and the Renaissance itself, in the absence of any conception of 'pure' literature, is shown as very prevalently interpreted in a politico-religious sense.

¹ '...Benedictus fructus ventris tui, *Ihesus*.'

The real subject of the book is the clash between old and new—the mediæval tradition and the forces of innovation. These are Protean. The quotations show how at first (in fact down to the definition of the Elizabethan ecclesiastical settlement) Puritan and Humanist were almost indistinguishable. During the same years ‘realism,’ ‘rationalism,’ ‘liberalism,’ Classicism (in so far, it should be added, as any of these modern-sounding ‘isms’ were realised then) were on the whole Protestant movements. This, however, was only the first phase. Later, owing to the determination of Elizabeth’s government to maintain, by means of the Anglican compromise, doctrinal and ceremonial continuity with the past, the Puritan narrowed his ground. Only the rarer type—the Spenser-Milton type—preserved the mid-century width of thought and programme.

The earlier phases of this process are presented with almost diagrammatic simplification. The opposing parties are classified—‘liberal’ *versus* ‘obscurantist’ and so on—and what have often been seen as haphazard efforts and confused tendencies are sorted into ‘movements,’ such as the ‘youth movement,’ centring in the Inns of Court, with which the ‘translation movement’ is very largely to be identified. The change, whatever it was, which was initiated by such divers leaders as Erasmus and Henry VIII, is briefly epitomised as the ‘revolution.’ This provokes reservations, but as the evidence is accumulated, the diagrammatic effect very largely disappears. The prefaces of the translators establish the fact that the writers’ efforts were deliberate and co-ordinated; they constituted a programme, and were tenaciously carried on in the teeth of an organised reactionary opposition, which, whether ‘reformed’ or not, represented an older habit of mind, distrustful of the dissemination of learning, uninterested in, or hostile to, the vernacular, resentful of any enlargement of the secular domain.

The mid-Tudor period is a dark, even a drab, one. One of the outstanding facts about it is the failure to advance upon the spirit and standards of Humanism already reached in Henry VIII’s reign. While the Church was still entire it was possible for Sir Thomas More to make a very English synthesis and combine the best of both worlds. The change of faith offers an obvious explanation of the lack of continuity in spirit and tone, yet Spenser, later in the century, was to make a not dissimilar synthesis. The value of Dr Conley’s researches lies in the illustration they afford of the causes of retardation in the interregnum between Surrey and Spenser, and of the ramifications and interactions of politics, religion, ethics and literature. The reader can see for himself how naturally the stream of tendency is leading towards the topical and satirical side of Spenser’s work. Finally, recognition is accorded to the labours of an ardent and youthful body of men, whose ‘Saxon’ prose is often bald and clumsy and whose verse is generally ‘the right butter-women’s rank to market,’ but whose work nevertheless contained a genuinely modernising principle and helped to secure for the later Elizabethan the necessary breadth of basis.

G. D. WILLCOCK.

ENGLEFIELD GREEN, SURREY.

The Sources of Hamlet: With Essay on the Legend. By Sir ISRAEL GOLLANCZ. London: H. Milford. 1926. x + 321 pp. 3s. 6d.

Sir Israel Gollancz is the General Editor of *The Shakespeare Classics*, the well-known and attractive series of volumes containing 'the sources and originals' of Shakespeare's plays. The series, formerly published by Messrs Chatto and Windus, now appears with the imprint of the Oxford University Press, but the original format has, I am glad to say, been preserved. This present volume, the first for which Sir Israel is personally as well as generally responsible, brings up the tale of those now published to a dozen.

In this work Sir Israel takes the opportunity of killing two birds with one stone. Nearly thirty years ago in his *Hamlet in Iceland* he published the text of the Ambales Saga, with a translation, and with appendices including extracts from the five Ambales Rimur. This 'volume of strange lore,' as he calls it, also included an introductory essay dealing with the development of the Hamlet legend. It will be remembered that starting from Snæbjorn's allusion (quoted by Snorri Sturlason) to 'Amlöða molu,' Sir Israel traced successively the obscure Northern elements in the story; the influence of the Lucius Junius Brutus tale upon Saxo's narrative; the relations between the 'Havelok Cuheran' (Anlaf Curan) and the Hamlet romances; and the previously overlooked mention about 919 by the Irish Queen Gornflaith of 'Amlaidhe' at the battle of Ath-Cliath—apparently as the name of Sitric, Anlaf Curan's father. Later the father and son were blended in popular legend, and Sir Israel's conclusion was that 'the Celtic West, more particularly the Scandinavian Kingdom of Ireland, was the locality where the Northern tale of "Hamlet" as we know it from Saxo, was finally developed some time in the eleventh century.'

Hamlet in Iceland has been for some time out of print, and instead of reissuing it, Sir Israel here reprints, with some omissions and slight changes, the introductory essay, and replaces the Ambales Saga and Rimur by Saxo's Latin story of Hamlet, with Professor Elton's translation, Belleforest's tale from the *Histoires Tragiques* and the *Hystorie of Hamblet* (1608). He states that during the past quarter of a century he has given long and careful consideration to opinions opposed to those expressed in his essay, but that he remains 'convinced it will ultimately be conceded that the story developed (as I attempted to show) under Celtic influences.' Among these hostile views is that of Professor Marstrander in *Bidrag til det Norske Sprogs Historie i Irland* who holds that the equation, Amlaidhe = Amlöði, cannot be justified according to regular phonetic law. Sir Israel contends that the equivalent forms of names do not always follow normal phonetic rule. It is not for me to come between the fell incensed points of philological disputants, but once again we see how inextricably literary and linguistic problems are bound together in historical investigation. And this is further illustrated in the discussion of the Yorkshire phrases 'play Hamlet with,' and 'Hamlet to pay,' with the variant 'Avlot' or 'Avleck' discovered by Professor Moorman, who thought (as Sir Israel states) that 'we have here

a memory of the terror struck in the breasts of the Yorkshire farmers of the tenth century by the harrying raids of Anlaf Curan.' Have Yorkshiresmen such long memories? I doubt it.

In his 1898 essay Sir Israel had discussed some of the chief features of the Hamlet story as told by Saxo. It is now very convenient to have the Latin text from the *editio princeps*, 1514, with some variants in the Notes from later critical editions. Facing this Latin text is Professor Elton's translation reprinted from his *The First Nine Books of the Danish History* (1894). These are followed by Belleforest's French romance from volume v of the *Histoires Tragiques*, faced by the *Hystorie of Hamblet* 1608. Belleforest's version of the story is here reprinted not from the Lyons edition of 1576, but the Paris edition of 1582, which is 'reueu, corrigé & augmenté,' and with which the *Hystorie of Hamblet* corresponds more closely. Sir Israel takes the view that *Hamblet* is a seventeenth-century spelling and that the use of the two forms, *Hamblet* and *Hamlet*, in the *Hystorie* gives no support to the theory of the existence of an edition of the translation before the Shakespearian play, and of a revision in 1608.

A detailed discussion of the relation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* to a lost dramatic source, whether from the pen of Kyd or another, was no doubt looked upon as outside the scope of this volume. But this problem has been so widely and so variously handled since 1898 when *Hamlet in Iceland* was published that I regret that Sir Israel did not add a short section upon it when revising his introductory essay for republication in *The Sources of Hamlet*. For anything that is said there to the contrary, it might be assumed by the unsophisticated that Shakespeare had gone direct to Belleforest for his plot. How much would we give to know what exactly happened between the publication of the Paris edition of the *Histoires Tragiques* in 1582 and of the First Quarto in 1603! On this Sir Israel declines to speculate, but he has made accessible the earlier transformations of the story in many ages and many lands before it reached the stage. And to the elucidation of the problems involved he has brought an admirable union, never common and in these days of specialisation increasingly rare, of classical, Scandinavian and Elizabethan scholarship.

F. S. BOAS.

LONDON.

Shakespeare in India: Popular Adaptations on the Bombay Stage. By C. J. SISON. (Shakespeare Association.) London: H. Milford. 1926. 26 pp. 2s.

On Two Problems in Shakespeare (Hamlet and Troilus and Cressida). By P. K. GUHA. (*Dacca University Bulletin*, No. ix.) London: H. Milford. 1926. 41 pp. 1s. 6d.

The above two pamphlets testify in different ways to the influence of Shakespeare in India, the one as he affords a subject for academic discussion, the other as he is a living force on the native stage in Bombay, where adaptations of his plays furnished a principal source of enter-

tainment till the national movement and the growth of the cinema checked their popularity.

These adaptations, or rather total re-writings of the plays, with their interpolations even of sub-plots, their alterations of the story, their substitution of happy for tragic endings and of native for Elizabethan thought, are welcomed by Mr Sisson as the effect of Shakespeare as a living force, and thus totally different from academic and occasional productions of given plays before educated audiences; and these versions are evidently such, for, as described, they appear to be more or less new creations suggested by the plots and characters of Shakespeare.

Mr Sisson compares the native treatment of originals with the way in which the Elizabethans treated classical or other drama, and finds interesting parallels between the practices of the Elizabethan and Indian stages. Instances are that the Indian actors are sharers in the theatre profits, that there is collaboration of authors, that women's parts are played by men, and that short-hand copies of plays are piratically obtained for rival companies or the press. All this is very interesting and worth study, and Mr Sisson looks for revival of this Shakespearian drama with good effect on native developments.

The other pamphlet contains the thoughtful attempts of Mr Guha to solve the so-called problems of two plays, *Hamlet* and *Troilus and Cressida*. With regard to the former, the author's search for a solution starts from the point that if Hamlet's delay is a mystery, the play is a complete failure as a work of art. He dismisses Coleridge's and other theories as implying that Hamlet ceases to be a conscious agent, and as leaving no room for conflict in his mind, since he can only act as his 'constitutional nature' dictates. 'Now this,' says Mr Guha, 'goes counter to the fundamental principle of Shakespeare's conception of the tragic hero, who is always a free agent whose action is ultimately dictated by his own personal choice.' So he is, like Hamlet, within the limits of his nature and character; but, leaving that aside, it really does not much matter, as affecting free agency, whether Hamlet's inaction is due to a constitutional excess of the speculative habit of mind, or, as in Mr Guha's view, to an acquired conviction that, as he cannot reform the whole rotten and corrupt world of humanity, vengeance on the King is a futile thing. If such a conviction dulls his spirit of personal vengeance *without his knowing it* and holds him back, it paralyses his action, against his declared will, as effectively as anything else. Mr Guha's argument should, however, be read as ably set forth by himself.

The discussion of *Troilus and Cressida* seeks to establish its unity of structure and purpose against those who deny it, by showing how both camp story and love story are contrived to display derisively the human folly of making too much of women, the result individually of infatuation and nationally of chivalric or quixotic sacrifice. In this he has been anticipated; but he is an independent critic and finds no further satiric purpose in the play, dismissing the idea that it laughs at Chapman or Homer, and ignoring its supposed connexion with the Stage Quarrel.

R. H. CASE.

LIVERPOOL.

The History and Sources of Percy's Memoir of Goldsmith. By KATHERINE C. BALDERSTONE. Cambridge: University Press. 1926. 61 pp. 3s. 6d.

Oliver Goldsmith's The Citizen of the World. A Study. By HAMILTON JEWETT SMITH. (*Yale Studies in English*, LXXI.) New Haven, Conn.; Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1926. xii + 175 pp. 8s. 6d.

These two books have their origin in dissertations embodying definite pieces of research, undertaken with a view to acquiring the Degree of Ph.D. at Yale. As achievements they differ greatly in quality. Mr Smith has apparently published his results *in extenso*, while Miss Balderstone has exercised the privilege of selection and has given us a valuable and interesting fraction.

Her work would have gained greatly in usefulness had it been printed as an introduction to a new edition of the well-nigh inaccessible Memoir which is its subject. As it is her survey is likely for some time to have more readers than the biography itself.

She has been fortunate in the discovery of new material, chiefly in the collection of Miss Constance Meade, and has handled it with skill and scholarship. The most important of her newly published documents is the memorandum dictated apparently by Goldsmith to Percy containing those details which the former wished to be incorporated in the account of his life that Percy was planning. This document, printed here in full for the first time with Percy's corrections and significant underlinings, is the chief source of the subsequent Memoir. Miss Balderstone has thus found it 'possible to trace for the first time the history of the Memoir's genesis and publication, and to determine the sources of Percy's information.'

The first part of the book deals with the history of the Memoir, from the original dictated facts until its final appearance as a prefix to the 1801 edition of Goldsmith's works. We are shown how the office of biographer was transferred from Percy to Johnson and, on the latter's death, back again to Percy, whose genuine kindness and desire to help the surviving members of the poet's family came to nothing. His relations with his publishers were comically unsatisfactory, while social and ecclesiastical ambitions made him increasingly timid and cautious in his literary enterprises. Publication was deferred from year to year. Most of the facts contained in the Memoir are traced—in the table which concludes the book—to four chief sources, written documents in Percy's possession, his personal knowledge of Goldsmith, stories contributed by William Farr, who, it is convincingly suggested, supplied information to the 'Interpolator' whose additions so infuriated Percy, and anecdotes already printed.

Miss Balderstone has worked old and new material into an interesting monograph which any future biographer of Goldsmith will find indispensable.

Some of the ground surveyed by Mr Smith has recently been covered

by Mr A. L. Sells in *Les Sources françaises de Goldsmith*. He has attempted to trace the literary sources of Goldsmith's *Citizen of the World* and correctly to date and number these essays in their earlier form as Chinese letters. His survey is careful and detailed and the lists and tables which compose the second part of his book would furnish useful matter for a chapter on that part of Goldsmith's work which Mr Smith has chosen for his subject. But the dissertation in its present form is unworthy of publication as a book. The author has no sense of style and his pages abound in sentences which have no meaning at all (page 1 line 5 *et seq.*, page 5 line 16 *et seq.*) or which admit of several interpretations (page vii lines 3 and 4).

It is a pity that these faults detract so largely from the value of the results of Mr Smith's careful research. His detailed analyses of the relation of *The Citizen of the World* to its several sources are interesting, while his list of works 'containing the foreign observer device or otherwise suggesting *The Citizen of the World*' provides useful reminders of some anticipations of Goldsmith's literary devices.

H. V. D. DYSON.

READING.

A Bibliography of Writings on the English Language from the Beginning of Printing to the end of 1922. By ARTHUR G. KENNEDY. Cambridge and Newhaven: Harvard Univ. Press and Yale Univ. Press; London: H. Milford. 1927. xvii + 517 pp. 105s.

Professor Kennedy in this volume has presented to the world of English scholarship a work of the greatest value, and he is to be very cordially congratulated on the completion of a fourteen years' task. The work is one that has long needed doing. The development of English studies during the last fifty years has been so rapid, the channels of publication have been so varied that it has become impossible when embarking upon any piece of research to find out just what has been already done in that field. This volume with its careful divisions and sub-divisions and its subject-index has gone as far as it is humanly possible in the direction of meeting that difficulty, and no school of English studies can afford to forgo this piece of equipment in spite of the somewhat heavy price. That price finds its justification however in the excellent format of the book, a model of clearness in its type and general setting forth, and, unlike so many American books, pleasantly light in the hand in spite of its size.

Some of the articles attempt tasks in which hitherto no guiding help has been available. One might refer here especially to the articles commencing on pp. 141, 184, and 313, which give in alphabetical order lists of the words in Anglo-Saxon, Middle English and Modern English which have been the subject of special study in various articles and periodicals. In the absence of any etymological dictionary of either Anglo-Saxon or Middle English the two former are specially useful and all three must have been matters of infinite labour.

In many of its sub-headings the bibliography provides material on which one might proceed to follow out lines of investigation. The story of the development of English Grammars, of Interlingual Grammars, of English Dictionaries, of attempts at the reform of English Spelling, of the history of Early English studies and many another theme might be tracked out from this volume. You could at once find for what English authors there exist full concordances and you could find the material for the history of the teaching of English both at home and abroad.

The work is remarkably free from errors so far as it has been tested, and that fairly thoroughly. In item no. 1600 *Harben* appears as *Habben*, in nos. 2326, 2331 and 2352 and in the Index, Mr Bruce *Dickins* appears as *Dickens* and in no. 13387 Dr G. B. *Grundy* is disguised as *Grierly*. The bibliographical detail that Sweet's *Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon* was published in New York and London by Macmillan in 1897 seems at fault. My own copy and any others that I have come across are dated 'Oxford, at the Clarendon Press' in that year.

It seems impossible to catch the compiler out in any serious omission. Once or twice one thought one had done it but the work in question was found under another heading. This certainly does suggest that rather more cross-references from one article to another would have been a good thing. There is no clear reason why modern books on the place-names of Beds., Cambs., Derbyshire, Gloucestershire, Notts., Suffolk, Wilts. and Worcestershire are entered as items under the chapter 'General and Historical,' sub-division 'Place-names of Special Localities,' while exactly similar volumes on the counties of Berkshire, Cumberland and Westmorland, Durham and Northumberland, Hertfordshire, Huntingdonshire, Lancashire, Middlesex, Oxfordshire, Staffordshire, Sussex, Warwickshire and Yorkshire are entered under the chapter 'Modern English,' sub-division 'Place-names of Special Localities' and there should at least have been cross-references from one section to the other. Without such one might think that there was no book on Lancashire by Professor Ekwall! The Subject-index would put one on the track if one turned to it but that is an unsatisfactory substitute for cross-references when the original division is so illogical.

One can only hope that in due course this volume may be followed up by supplementary bibliographies say at intervals of five years, or slightly longer. The task of compilation has been made comparatively easy by the excellent annual Bibliographies issued by the Modern Humanities Research Association but these need incorporation in larger ones covering a period of several years. One can only hope that Professor Kennedy or some other equally competent and devoted scholar will take up this task.

A. MAWER.

LIVERPOOL.

The English Language in America. By GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP. 2 vols. New York: The Century Co.; London: H. Milford. 1925. xiii + 377 pp. and 355 pp. 42s.

In appraising a book written by an American professor on the varieties of English current in America a British reviewer can, at best, indicate the subjects surveyed in it, record his general impression of its planning and presentment, and add one or two supplementary notes where the problems transcend the American limits.

Conceived on a generous scale, this work provides a detailed historical and descriptive introduction to the phonology (two-thirds of vol. II), inflexion, syntax and stylistics of American English together with brief surveys of the vicissitudes of American spelling and American dictionaries. The whole forms an imposing edifice based on a solid foundation of careful reading and discriminating observation and fitted together with sober and convincing arguments. The Bibliography alone occupies 11 pp. and reference is facilitated by a Subject-index in addition to the Word-index.

From an embarrassing wealth of data a few points may be selected as likely to prove specially interesting to the British student. In the rough classification of U.S. English into an Eastern type (with subvarieties of New England speech, e.g. Boston, Connecticut, etc.), a Southern type (Virginian, etc.) and a Western or General type (from west of the Alleghanies to the Pacific coast we have types which, 'though not finally and scientifically differentiated either socially or geographically in the popular mind, are nevertheless in practice distinguishable in the experience of every observant American' (vol. I, p. 36). New England speech is nearest to Southern British English; in particular 'we are to look for the roots of Eastern Massachusetts speech in the Eastern dialects of England' (quotation from Orbeck, vol. I, p. 57)—a fact easily understood when it is realised that over 67 per cent. of the pioneers came from the coast counties from (and including) London to the Wash. The kinship of the Western type with the Northern British English appears from the use of undiphthongised *ē* and *ō*, consonantal *r* in *bird*, and *æ* in *path*, etc. To the limited experience of the reviewer it seems that the Southern form with its lesser degree of nasalisation, its softness and its subtler modulations approximates more closely to the Received Standard over here than do the others. At the same time it may well be that 'in every case the distinctive features' of American pronunciation [including the 'drawl' and the 'twang'] 'have been but survivals from older usages which were, and in some instances still are, to be found in some dialect or other of the speech of England' (vol. II, p. 28). Emphasis is laid upon the striving towards national uniformity as one of the 'notable characteristics of the American mother tongue' (vol. I, p. 18). Transfusion and interpenetration seem to have prevented the formation of pronounced local dialects, though the more remote mountain speech of the Tennessee and Kentucky highlands constitute what the Germans call *Rest-* or *Reliktgebiete* with

their archaisms and uncouth forms (vol. I, p. 229). The influence of the foreigner on pronunciation is absolutely negligible, his contribution to the vocabulary relatively unimportant.

In the chapter on Vocabulary it is of interest to note that the British would now hardly consider the once banned *belittle*, *lengthy* and *progress* (vb.) as Americanisms. Of obsolete American words which have survived in our dialects I single out the following for special reasons: *spong* 'a strip or section of meadow' (*E.D.D.* quotes from Leicester, Northampton and E. Antrim), with which one might compare N. Frisian (Outzen) *spong* 'a small brook, a bridge over a stream'; *doak*, *doke*, *dolk* for 'valley,' now used in Yorkshire for 'a hollow' in the form *dawk*, cf. E. Antrim *delk* 'dent, dimple' and the Island Frisian (Föhr) *dälk* 'dimple'; *earebred* (Hempstead Records 1675 in the phrase 'to pine the earebred' in connexion with a cart and wheels), conjectured by the author, though hesitantly (vol. I, p. 87), to be the 'plough-board,' but really the same word as the Yorkshire, Notts and N. Lincolnshire *earbreed*, *heerbreads*, defined s.v. the latter form in the *E.D.D.* as 'the back and front cross-bars in the frame of the bottom of a cart'; *langle* occurring in the Watertown Records of 1669 in the phrase 'side langued with iron fetters' still occurring in our North Country dialects in the sense of 'to hobble.' These and many other words treated by the author are obsolete in Modern American as they are in Standard English, and he has justification for repudiating the 'popular and erroneous notion...that American English being by origin provincial is unusually archaic' (vol. I, p. 49). The paragraphs on words of Indian origin could now be expanded by reference to G. Friederici: *Hilfswörterbuch für den Amerikanisten* (Halle, 1926). From it one might add to the long list of Indian words (in Hodge's *Handbook of American Indians*) given on pp. 165 ff. of vol. I the following as being well known over here as well: *agouti*, *alpaca*, *arrowroot*, *banana*, *barbecue*, *cacique*, *caoutchouc*, *cayman*, *chile*, *chinchilla*, *coca*, *cochineal*, *cocoa*, *copal*, *coyote*, *guano*, *hammock*, *hurricane*, *iguana*, *ipecacuanha*, *jaguar*, *jerked beef*, *maize*, *manatee*, *manioc*, *maté*, *nopal*, *ocelot*, *peccary*, *picaninny* (if half Tupi), *puma*, *quinine*, *quipu*, *sago*, *sassafras*, *savannah*, *tapioca*, *tomato*, *toucan*, *vicuña*, *yam*. Naturally the author did not aim at exhaustiveness here. The early history of the international propagation of some of these words and their like will be found in W. Fritz Schmidt: *Die spanischen Elemente im französischen Wortschatz* (Beiheft LIV of the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*). In addition to the German contributions to the vocabulary quoted vol. I, p. 157, a word would have been apposite on the many translation-loans taken over by the psychologists, e.g. *feeling-tone*, *clang-colour* together with unassimilated forms like *Gestalt* (or 'configurational') psychology. Perhaps the German mechanic's *ausproben* or *ausprobieren* has supplied the model for *try out* recently imported here too, but the opposite process is more plausible in the case of the German *die Ware liefern* in the weekly edition of the *Berliner Tageblatt* (1926), which suggests the influence of the American salesman as does our *deliver the goods*, or the German *Gas geben*, which has a possible prototype in *to step on the gas*. No reference is made to

any lexical contributions from American possessions overseas and one is curious whether *ukalele* stands alone as a representative of Hawaii.

A few citations of English usage are open to correction. It is hardly correct that in Standard English one may still hear ['kimist], and it is misleading to say 'for clerk one may hear [klɜ:k],' the only accepted pronunciation to-day, or to say 'Worcester in Massachusetts is of course pronounced ['wu:stə] as in England,' whereas the English *u* is short. Far from being characteristically British *coal-hod* (quoted as 'said to be British,' the source perhaps being Mencken) is unknown to the reviewer who would always use *coal-scuttle* and is given by the *N.E.D.* as American and dialectal! Nor do we normally say 'to put coals in a grate' in preference to 'putting coal on the fire.' The pronunciation ['ɛftnənt], in which the initial *l* seems to have been inadvertently dropped, vol. I, p. 151, is totally unfamiliar in England, where [lɛft'ənənt] is the norm. Just as *cart-wheel* was used in America for a 'dollar,' so it was used here for a 'crown' and the question of priority is left undecided. The use of *car* for 'tram(-car)' is prevalent in Liverpool as well as in America (vol. I, p. 139).

Among the inflexional and syntactical forms treated in vol. II, pp. 255 ff. most appear in England too though not in careful cultivated speech. The past tense *dove* probably strikes most of us as an Americanism when used by an educated speaker. The expletive *it* on p. 269 might be further exemplified by *to beat it* recently imported here. *A-fishing*, etc. is apparently more old-fashioned here than in the American popular speech (p. 268). We are familiar with the adverbial use of *kind of* as a colloquialism, and occasionally hear *a real good sermon* (p. 270). One misses a reference in this context to what we regard as a typical Americanism: *right* in *right here*, *right there*, *right now*, or the use of the quantifiers *some* and *any* where we should use phrases like *a good (big)*, etc. and *at all* respectively, unless we consciously took over the Americanism, e.g. *some party*, *did you talk any?* etc.

In his chapter on Style the author is at pains to show that 'the Americanism of American literature has always been an Americanism of thought, of scene and of action' (vol. I, p. 291). The most convincing proof of the essential unity of English in its *written* form in both England and America is the unconscious witness of the author himself. Apart from such spelling habits as *center*, *dialog*, *esthetic* the reviewer has succeeded in unearthing only the following unimportant expressions, apparently non-British, which are scattered over 648 pages of text: *aside from*, *phrasal* preposition (vol. I, p. 77), *door-cheek* (door-jamb), *fugacious* (p. 114)—rare here except technically, *given names* (p. 169), *places with only two cats and a chimney* for 'dead-and-alive holes' (p. 192), *feathered* with so fine a name (p. 218), *head-forms* for the 'catch-words' or *lemmata* in a dictionary (p. 346).

Space forbids more than a mere mention of such themes as the adoption of the classical town-names in New York like Ithaca, etc., or the rise of American oratory or the legend of the taciturn Indian. No slight is intended to the entertaining and in its way valuable work of

Mencken when we claim that we have here for the first time a body of scientific research of a solid and enduring character, a work for which all who love their mother-tongue both here and in America may be truly grateful.

W. E. COLLINSON.

LIVERPOOL.

Les Œuvres Poétiques de Baudri de Bourgueil (1046–1130). Édition critique publiée d'après le manuscrit du Vatican. Par PHYLLIS ABRAHAMS. Paris: H. Champion. 1926. lx + 405 pp. 40 fr.

Dans une notice consacrée aux œuvres poétiques de Baudri de Bourgueil (premier numéro de la *Romania*, 1872, pp. 23–50) Léopold Delisle signalait la copie que Monsieur André Salmon¹ avait établie du MS. du Vatican, fonds de la reine de Suède 1351 (copie qui se trouve à la Bibliothèque de Tours), rétablissait l'ordre primitif des 254 pièces en vers latins dont Baudri de Bourgueil est l'auteur et qui avaient du fait du relieur été en partie déplacées, donnait une table analytique de ces poésies, indiquait le sujet de chacune d'elles, les éditions complètes ou partielles qui en existaient et citait dans les morceaux inédits les vers intéressants au point de vue littéraire et social. En somme cet article fournissait un plan excellent pour une édition des œuvres poétiques du célèbre archevêque de Dol. Et c'est de ce plan que Miss Abrahams s'est inspirée dans l'ouvrage dont nous rendons compte. Pour l'établissement du texte elle s'est servie des photographies du MS. du Vatican, mais pour quelques feuillets abîmés elle a eu recours à la copie d'André Salmon. Chaque pièce est précédée d'une analyse précise et suivie de notes qui contiennent des éclaircissements historiques et géographiques, des comparaisons avec les auteurs que Baudri a utilisés, des discussions sur le degré d'originalité des sujets traités.

L'introduction est fort bien comprise. Miss Abrahams y donne une bibliographie des ouvrages utilisés et cités au cours de son volume, une bibliographie des manuscrits et éditions des poésies de Baudri de Bourgueil, des indications détaillées sur la méthode qu'elle a suivie pour l'établissement du texte, une courte notice sur la vie et les œuvres de Baudri, une datation très précise de beaucoup de ces poèmes (les éléments historiques manquent malheureusement pour fixer même de façon approximative l'année où un assez grand nombre des pièces a été composé), un examen de l'intérêt historique et de la valeur littéraire des poèmes, une liste des auteurs qu'il a pratiqués, une étude sur le vocabulaire, la grammaire et le style des poèmes de Baudri et sur l'influence qu'il a exercée. Enfin elle y ajoute une table des titres, une table des incipit, une concordance avec l'édition de Duchesne, et une liste des destinataires des poèmes, liste comprenant successivement: (1) les papes, (2) les archevêques et évêques, (3) les archidiaques, chanoines, prêtres, (4) les abbés et prieurs, (5) les étudiants et maîtres, (6) les princes et

¹ Ancien élève de l'École des Chartes, archiviste de la ville de Tours, mort le 24 Septembre 1857.

nobles, (7) les autres amis laïques, (8) les scribes, (9) les religieuses, (10) les autres femmes, (11) les amis anonymes, (12) les personnages fictifs auxquels sont adressées les 254 pièces de Baudri. L'édition est ainsi rendue très maniable et permet de trouver immédiatement les renseignements dont on a besoin. Cet ensemble de tables de l'introduction est d'ailleurs complété par un index des noms propres qui se trouve pages 367-96 et par un glossaire (pp. 397-404).

Dans les différentes questions que soulève l'examen des poésies de Baudri, Miss Abrahams fait preuve de beaucoup de sagesse, de modération et d'esprit critique. Elle n'hésite pas à reconnaître le peu d'intérêt que présentent au point de vue historique les poèmes qu'elle publie; elle n'exagère pas non plus l'influence que ces poèmes ont exercée: elle prouve même de façon irréfutable que, contrairement à l'opinion de M. Pasquier, l'*Alexandreis* de Gautier de Lille n'est pas une imitation du poème adressé à la Comtesse Adèle de Blois, fille de Guillaume le Conquérant (pièce cxcvi, pp. 197-231), et que la source de Gautier de Lille se trouve non point dans Baudri mais dans Capella.

Il n'y a guère qu'une partie de l'ouvrage qui ne paraisse pas suffisante: c'est celle relative à l'influence du style de Baudri. Miss Abrahams voit dans cet auteur 'un vrai précurseur des poètes [latins] de la fin du XII^e siècle' et elle croit justifier cette opinion en la fondant sur les caractères des ornements de style qu'elle a étudiés très soigneusement aux pages xxx et suivantes. Mais elle reconnaît elle-même que ces ornements de style 'il les possède en commun avec ses contemporains.' La question revient donc à un dosage d'influences particulières et il faudrait, pour arriver à une solution précise, démêler l'importance des apports personnels des différents poètes comme Hildebert de Lavardin, Godefroi de Reims, Marbode, etc. qui ont certainement, eux aussi, influé sur les poètes latins de la fin du XII^e siècle. C'est un travail qui demanderait beaucoup de tact et de doigté et auquel on ne pourra se livrer de façon utile que lorsque notre connaissance de la littérature latine du moyen âge sera plus avancée.

Rien d'ailleurs ne contribuera plus que des ouvrages du genre de celui que vient de donner Miss Phyllis Abrahams à attirer de nouveau l'attention des érudits sur cette littérature latine médiévale qui est tombée en un injuste discrédit et dont l'étude permettra de mieux poser et de mieux résoudre un nombre considérable de problèmes que soulève l'étude des œuvres du moyen âge rédigées en latin et aussi de celles rédigées en langue vulgaire.

LOUIS BRANDIN.

LONDON.

L. SAINÉAN. *Les Sources indigènes de l'étymologie française*. Paris: Boccard. 1925. 2 vols. xii + 448, 519. 100 fr.

In *Les Sources indigènes de l'étymologie française* M. Sainéan claims to open up a new field to the French philologist. The aim of the etymologist since the time of Ménage has been to trace the Latin, Germanic, Greek,

Celtic, or other foreign origins of French, and, in spite of all efforts, a large proportion of words are still of unknown origin. The reason for this, M. Sainéan contends, is that past methods have ignored the creative genius of the masses. In the absence of attested Latin or other originals hypothetical Vulgar Latin forms have been reconstructed, but these, according to M. Sainéan, are for the most part nothing but 'fantômes lexicologiques,' and 'mirages étymologiques,' which have blinded us as to the true source of an important element of the French vocabulary, namely, metaphorical and spontaneous creation.

As might be expected from M. Sainéan's earlier works *Les Sources indigènes* is a masterly exposition, based on an intimate knowledge of French dialects and provincialisms. A large section of the work is devoted to metaphor and to the images to which animals, plants, inanimate nature, etc., have given rise. The goat, for instance, is responsible for *bègue*, *bégayer*, *bigle*, *biscoter*, *begaud* (sixteenth century), *bigot*, etc., all of which represent certain characteristics popularly attributed to the animal and are derived from various provincial names of the goat. Many such words have thus found their way into the literary language, where, owing to their dialectal form and their new meaning, they have become isolated; hence the difficulty in establishing their origin.

A further section deals with what the author calls 'concordances sémantiques,' in which a few of the more important associations of ideas are noted. One of these is the association of *bavarder* and words of similar meaning with *patauger*, giving the series *bagouler*, *barboter*, *barbouiller*, *bredouiller*, *clabauder*, *patois*, *potin*, *verve*,... the origins of which have so far puzzled the etymologist. Not only are these series interesting from a psychological standpoint, they also leave little doubt as to derivations which would otherwise seem extremely improbable, such as that of *patois* from the dialectal *patte* = *boue*.

M. Sainéan's policy is no less refreshing as regards spontaneous creation. Amongst the terms which he assigns to this origin are *cracher*, *horion*, *briser*, *frapper*, *fanfare*, *bondir*, *bique*, *cajoler*, *ahan*. But there is still the possibility that even an onomatopoeia is influenced by previously acquired linguistic habits, as when the author of the song, imitating the sound of the trumpet, writes:

Une belle petite trompi-trompette
Qui fait TRara deri derETTE,

for this process would to some extent explain the widely divergent forms used to express the same notion in different languages. At any rate, as far as child language is concerned, the identity of the initial in *dodo*, *dédé*, *gogo*, *lolo*, *nounou*, and in the corresponding terms of the general language: *dormir*, *doigt*, *gostier*, *lait*, *nourrice* can hardly be considered purely accidental, as M. Sainéan contends. The words in question are obviously the outcome of a child's imitative faculties combined with its love of alliteration.

M. Sainéan attaches great importance to the chronological factor, that is to say, the date and circumstances of the first appearance of the

word in the language, but one is inclined to accuse him in turn of being too systematic when he takes as his first principle of research that a word 'étranger à l'ancienne langue, attesté à la dernière période du moyen français, du *xiv^e* au *xvi^e* siècle, exclut à priori toute attache avec le latin,' especially in view of his statement that Du Cange, Littré, Godefroy and Hatzfeld-Darmesteter enable us 'more or less approximately' to give the chronology of every term of ancient or modern French. Moreover nothing but a complete repertory of Old French, which we shall never possess, would enable us to determine in every case which is the original and which the metaphorical meaning of a term. The only example, for instance, given by M. Sainéan, to support his statement that *hure* was originally an onomatopoeia applied to the owl is the line from the *Roman de la Rose*: 'Li chahuan o sa grant hure'; whereas the more general meaning is attested at a much earlier date. Although the Walloon *hurette* lends some colour to the argument, the strict chronologist still misses certain links in M. Sainéan's reasoning. Similarly the O.F. *gous*, prov. *cos*, is traced to the *css!* *gss!* *gss!*, with which one drives off a dog, an expression used by Rabelais, but surely the inverse is equally probable!

It is only in fact when the older methods have been applied with no result that one is justified in falling back upon the process of spontaneous creation, which must often be hypothetical, and it is our confidence therefore in what M. Sainéan often styles the 'superfluous' thoroughness of etymologists like M. Thomas that forms the most valid basis of the newer proposition. Even so, however, it is difficult to over-estimate the positive value of *Les Sources indigènes du français*, which is undoubtedly the most stimulating work on French lexicography that has appeared of recent years.

F. S. SHEARS.

ABERDEEN.

Historische französische Syntax. Von EUGEN LERCH. I. Band. Leipzig: O. R. Reisland. 1925. vii + 327 pp. 13 M. 80.

This historical French syntax (to be completed in four volumes) will supply a pressing need. Existing manuals have generally been recognised as inadequate but it has been difficult to supplement them, especially in this country, owing to the inaccessibility of the scattered materials, which are mostly in the form of German theses. Moreover, as the already vast repertory of Horluc and Marinet was being constantly enlarged, the task of consolidating past efforts was becoming so formidable that it threatened to surpass the powers of a single worker. Students of French philology will therefore be grateful to Professor Lerch for a thorough and up-to-date survey which promises to be a standard advanced text-book on the subject for many years.

This first volume is devoted to the conjunction which thus receives at last an adequate place in the study of syntax. Professor Lerch pays especial attention to Latin usage, a knowledge of which is too often

assumed in works of this kind, but the most striking result of the parallel which he draws between the two languages is that the French conjunction owes comparatively little to Latin tradition. None of the Latin causal, adversative, concessive, or final conjunctions have remained, their place having been taken by the new expressions, *parce que*, *puisque*, *quoique*, *bien que*, *afin que*, etc.

Professor Lerch adheres in the main to the older method of classification, treating each conjunction separately; at times however he is tempted to take the idea as his point of departure, proceeding to study its various modes of expression. There is naturally some overlapping: a special chapter is devoted to *que* which also appears in other sections, e.g. causal conjunctions and restrictive conjunctions; similarly *comme*, treated in chapter IV, also appears in chapter III. Although the arrangement is generally clear, it cannot be said therefore that Professor Lerch has helped to solve the classification problem. We are surprised, in fact, to find no reference to M. Brunot's *La Pensée et la Langue* which initiates such a striking departure in this respect, and which, incidentally, would have strengthened Professor Lerch's work on the modern side: the causal uses of *après que*, *du moment que*, *dès que* and the examples of *maintenant que*, *à présent que*, quoted by M. Brunot are parallel cases to the causal *puisque* and *quand* and might well have been quoted to illustrate the transition in meaning of the older conjunctions.

The following observations concern mainly matters of detail:

p. 39. The date 1200 assigned to Joinville's *Mémoires* is doubtlessly a misprint.

p. 39. An earlier example of *nonobstant* (which the author says is found for the first time in Nicole Oresme) is to be found in the *Documents parisiens du règne de Philippe VI*, dated 1336. Apparently therefore the word entered the language through legal channels.

p. 53. In expressions such as: *et font pleines les males entre or fin et argent*, the author rejects a psychological explanation of the use of *entre* on the grounds that the construction is not found outside the Romance group of languages; he considers that this usage was determined by some mediæval Latin expression, possibly by the formula *judicet Dominus (inter) me et te*. There seems however to be no reason to seek an outside factor to explain this transition of meaning, which can easily be followed from constructions such as: 'et me manda que... nous loissiens une nef *entre* li et moy' (Joinville, 113), where an English translator renders *entre* by *between*, to the copulative use in expressions such as: 'quant vint au vendredi *entre* moy et mon signour Erart, tuit armé alames au roi...' (id. 151).

p. 60. An explanation of the use of *se* for *si* in *Aucassin* is given by Mario Roques in the introduction to his edition, p. xvii.

p. 71. The author has not noted that in the example of *et* for *si* quoted from Villehardouin: 'quant ce vint as lances baissier, *et* li Greulor tornerent les dos,' and in all the other examples of the same construction, taken from *Aucassin*, the subject of the following sentence is a substantive. This appears to be more than a mere coincidence:

normally *si* demands inversion but this is not apparent when the subject is a pronoun, which is not expressed: e.g. 'quant Aucassins vit celle mervelle, si vint au roi.' The substitution of *et* for *si* therefore would seem to point to that same tendency to avoid inversion, which helped to bring about the disappearance of *ainz* in the sixteenth century.

p. 93. *Avant* instead of the more usual *ainz* is found in Froissart (Luce, I, p. 268): 'Mais pour ces jours ils (sc. li Escocois) n'estoient pas retrait, *avant* ardoient en Northomberlant.' This of course may be an innovation but it is quite possible that it represents a tradition found already in the ambiguous example of St Alexis:

Il ne la lit ned il dedenz n'esguardet:

Avant la tent [MS. A, *Einz* la tendi] ad un bon clerc e savie.

p. 210. For the line: 'N'a que nos dous en ceste rote' (*Mystère d'Adam*, 240) the German translation *auf dieser Strasse* is surely nonsensical.

p. 240. The use of *de* after a comparative and before a pronoun (e.g. plus fort *de* moi) was not rare in the fourteenth century as Professor Lerch supposes: Nicole Oresme, *Le Ménagier de Paris*, le Chevalier de la Tour Landry and Froissart offer numerous examples. There is no reason therefore to consider its frequency in the sixteenth century to be due to Italian influence.

F. S. SHEARS.

ABERDEEN.

Le Lai d'Haveloc and Gaimar's Haveloc Episode. Edited by ALEXANDER BELL. Manchester: University Press. 1925. cxli + 127 pp. 7s. 6d.

This substantial volume, the fourth of the series of Old French Texts published by the University of Manchester, takes its place worthily beside its predecessors. The editor, Mr Bell, has been occupied for many years with Gaimar's *Estoire des Engles* and has already made public some of the results of his researches (cf. vol. xv of this *Review*, p. 170; *Notes and Queries*, XII, s. VIII, p. 104). It is however to the convenience of all that he should have incorporated these results in his introduction to this volume together with the other conclusions that are the fruit of further patient and careful investigation of the texts themselves and other relevant documents. Briefly summarised his closely argued conclusions as to the authorship of the *Lai* and of the *Haveloc Episode* in the *Estoire* and their relations to each other and local legend are as follows: (1) Gaimar's patroness, 'dame Custance la gentil,' was the wife of Raul le fiz Gilebert, the holder of fiefs both in Hampshire and Lincolnshire (Intr. pp. 75 f.) and this double holding afforded Gaimar the opportunity of making acquaintance with local legend in both regions. (2) Gaimar appears to have come across the *Haveloc* story only after he had made his adaptation of the *A.S. Chronicle*, and so he gave it a prologue and fitted it 'as well as possible into the only available place for it—the obscure period between the death of Arthur and the foundation of Wessex' (pp. 1–6, 78). (3) The thirteenth-century *Lai d'Haveloc* is the work of a writer who, 'recently

arrived from abroad and settled in Lincolnshire' (pp. 28, 59), came across Gaimar's story and refashioned it as a 'Breton Lai' under the direct influence of the *Lais* of Marie de France (pp. 51-55), also utilising further local variants (pp. 58-60).

The linguistic side of the introduction—the determination of the relation between the MSS., the constitution of the text and the study of the language—is treated also with sound knowledge and meticulous care; but in view of the possibility of a second edition a few points of detail may here be noted for the editor's consideration; several of these are terminological only. The term *mutation* (employed pp. 107 and 139) is surely too frequently employed by other scholars to render the term *Umlaut* to serve also as the equivalent of *amuïssement* (p. 107). The sentences discussed on p. 107, *Apareilla de ses privez* and *jo dorai des granz lardez*, appear to be not so much 'clear examples of partitives' as examples of that partitive use of the preposition *de*, that is exemplified already in Late Latin, in sentences of the type *effundam de spiritu meo* (Vulgate), *non habeo de parentibus* (cf. Brunot, I, p. 96). From the standpoint of Old French the article may hardly be said to be 'omitted' before nouns used in a general sense or abstract nouns (p. 111). The verb-forms *Endormiz est* and *il sunt...comande*, cited on p. 115, are surely examples of the older method of forming the past tense of reflexive verbs rather than examples of 'verbs used reflexively without reflexive pronoun' (cf. Tobler, *Vrai Aniel*, p. 166). To attribute a 'governing' power to conjunctions is to make use of a somewhat antiquated expression. In the tabular statement of types of clauses (p. 121) A 2 is headed as 'clauses of emotional activity,' but it is noteworthy that in all three examples the verb of the principal clause is one of *fear*, a verb that is traditionally followed by the subjunctive in a dependent clause. With verbs denoting emotional activities of other kinds in Old French, the subordinate clause introduced by *que* is *causal* and the mood in consequence ordinarily indicative. In A 5 the category 'impersonal activity' is unnecessary, it forms indeed a cross classification.

In the text of the *Lai* the reading of the two MSS. might be retained in lines 27 *En icel tens q(ue) Artur regna* and 393 *Ke il l'ama e od li jut* and ll. 27 and 28 may well be translated 'In that time that (= when) Arthur reigned, he crossed the sea to Denmark,' and in l. 393 *Ke*, conjunction, may readily stand in hiatus. In l. 295 *si* is perhaps better taken as derived from *sic*, and the comma after *e* omitted, then ll. 295-6 interpreted literally would run: 'And (that) he should keep his oath in such wise that he should acquit himself of it loyally.' In l. 950 the metre might more simply be rectified by reading *cume* for *cum* and in the next couplet there appears to be an abrupt change to direct speech that should be indicated.

The one disputable feature of the edition is the treatment of the orthography, for, to suit the capacity of readers other than 'professed students of Old French,' the editor has gone a long way towards the standardisation of the spelling. The changes introduced are carefully noted in the introduction, and the more important variants are given

at the bottom of the page, but none the less the attempt appears to me to be regrettable for it introduces much that is merely conjectural and a principle that is entirely at variance with mediæval practice. The book as a whole, however, is a most welcome addition to the sadly small number of Old French texts that have found in this country a fully equipped and competent editor.

M. K. POPE.

OXFORD.

A New History of Spanish Literature. By JAMES FITZMAURICE-KELLY. London: H. Milford. 1926. viii + 551 pp. 12s. 6d.

In the preface to this masterly abridgment of a classic of scholarship, now issued in pious memory of its late distinguished author, Mrs Fitzmaurice-Kelly tells how the book was continually beside her husband: 'He worked at it continually—revising, correcting and perfecting: he embodied in it the results, not only of his own research, but of the criticisms and suggestions which he noted on the blank pages. And he continued to do this until within three days of his death (November 30, 1923).' First issued in 1898, this work as immediately eclipsed Ticknor as Ticknor had eclipsed Bouterwek. It was then a pleasant companion to Spanish literature, with a profusion of translated quotations and a full, but discursive, bibliography. It was the bibliography and the bibliographical exactitude of the text which called forth the admiration of specialists, and in the French revision of 1913 (destined to be a standard text-book in France, Germany and Spain itself) the bibliography became a thing apart, and the text more serried with names, dates and allusions. At the same time, however, the interests of the beginner and the general reader were sacrificed to some extent, and between the tyro and Spanish literature there grew up a spear-hedge of names, dates and titles. Now that the treatise by Hurtado and Palencia has to a large extent superseded this work as a tool in the study, it was well that a simplification should be attempted. Essentially the same as the editions published since 1914, the present volume, by rearranging or modifying the exposition in several important respects, permits the reader to gain a clearer impression of the essentials of the subject. It is written with unfailing humour and insight into literary values. A cool judge of Spanish literature, the author can give eloquent praise where praise is due. The technical bibliography is printed elsewhere for specialists, but summary notes at the foot of the pages give the reader what guidance he requires. Passages quoted in the original are translated, and several authors receive quite a fresh treatment. The chapter headings now refer to literary, not political, chronology. There is new matter incorporated in the text, such as, for instance, the improved statement concerning *Lazarillo de Tormes* on p. 198, which is not to be found in the Spanish edition of the same date of publication. There are still, perhaps, rather many titles and dates in the text, and the book might have been easier reading had this sort of information been transferred to the notes as in M. Lanson's *Histoire de la Littérature*

Française, but in general the process of simplification and revivification has been carried through with noteworthy success.

It is tempting to speculate on the future of this work. It is now unquestionably the best introduction to the subject in English, and probably rivalled only by E. Mérimée's *Précis* in any tongue, although for the advanced student the Spanish history already referred to has definitively become a standard of reference. The late Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly's career was contemporary with the application of scientific scholarship to the study of Spanish literature, but that scholarship has now greatly increased in momentum, and the face of truth is changing rapidly. In the short time that has elapsed since the author's death two studies on Góngora have made the treatment of the *Soledades* (p. 333, etc.) appear unduly frigid. In connexion with Luis de León's poems, little more has been done than to define the problem. That the pre-romantic Cabanyes (p. 444) should be treated after the full-blooded romantic Espronceda shows that the author did not have leisure to assimilate the results achieved by Professor Peers' work cited in the note. It is hardly to be expected that the Renaissance Latinists can long be excluded from a historical account of Spanish literature when the studies of Messrs Bell, Llubera and Atkinson (to mention only our own researchers) have begun to bear fruit. But the most vulnerable part of this work is, and has always been, as the late M. Alfred Morel-Fatio remarked, the Middle Ages. Baist long ago demonstrated the immense importance of twelfth-century Latinity for the beginnings of Spanish prose and verse, and this demonstration has been greatly strengthened by the light recently cast by Sr Menéndez Pidal on the literary ambitions and figures at the court of the Alfonsos of the 'Empire.' The omission of all adequate acknowledgment of this Latinity has, however, been one of the features of this revision. That the history of (at least) the mediæval culture of Spain is Pan-Iberian in its scope is a view which cannot long, I believe, be resisted, and the Galician *cancioneiros* and Camões will re-enter the history of Spanish literature alongside of Gil Vicente, Sá de Miranda and Melo, whose claims were not to be ignored even in this more restricted conception of the subject. The great parallel and (in part) interagent series of royal chronicles of Castile, Portugal and Catalonia would then call in question the judgment that 'Spain is undeniably weak in history' (p. 55). The statement of Sr Menéndez Pidal's theory of the origin of ballads (p. 67) is too summary to serve for the latest pronouncements of that most subtle thinker. By refusing to discuss any *Amadis de Gaula* save Montalvo's redaction at the opening of the Golden Age, and by a parallel refusal to attribute significance to the Arthurian translations, the whole history of mediæval fiction is seriously warped, as well as, of course, the influence which that branch of letters might exercise on other branches or on social conventions. The Tristan ballad, for instance, is cited on p. 78, and the novel it is textually based upon on p. 139, while on pp. 69-70 a phrase (probably misprinted) seems to speak of Arthurian *cantares de gesta*! It is probably too early to estimate the readjustments of values which we are to expect

from Professor Peers' studies in the Mystics; but, on the other hand, Professor H. R. Lang's recently published edition of the *Cid* produces an impression of the instability of several received notions concerning the *cantares de gesta* and chronicles, which affect more than one statement of this history.

This feeling of momentum and advance, which is already so perceptible in the course of only three years, is something in which Spanish scholarship cannot, in the end, but feel a certain pride. But it would never have been possible had it not been for the stability and guidance given to research by the great *History of Spanish Literature*, which held sway, almost without a rival, for a generation, and of whose empire the end is not yet.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

GLASGOW.

Lichtdrucke nach althochdeutschen Handschriften Codd. Par. Lat. 7640, S. Gall. 911, Aug. CXI, Jun. 25, Lobcow. 434. Herausgegeben von GEORG BAESECKE. Halle: M. Niemeyer. 1926. 8 pp. and 38 Pl. 12 M.

Professor Baesecke has here published a selection from the photographic reproductions of Old High German manuscripts belonging to the Deutsche Seminar of the University of Halle. There is no need to dwell on the importance of such facsimiles for palæographers and students seeking a clearer understanding of the mediæval spirit; they cannot altogether replace the originals, but they bring to the student a breath from the old monastic *scriptorium*, and often afford the skilled palæographer important glimpses into the nature of the exemplar from which the copy is derived, or reveal geographical and monastic connexions otherwise undiscernible. It would be well if some benefactor would consider the foundation of an institute to undertake the systematic photographic reproduction of mediæval MSS. for distribution to University libraries and palæographers.

The present selection has been partly conditioned by Professor Baesecke's own interest in the oldest German glosses, and partly to give German students specimens of two manuscripts at Paris and in the Bodleian. Thus the present instalment gives the principal representatives of the so-called *Keronische Glossar* and the *Murbacher Hymnen*—the latter from the Bodleian. The volume contains the following reproductions. 1. Parisianus (Pa) Lat. 7640, reproduced *in extenso*, Pls. 1–20, written by one apparently experienced scribe of the early ninth century in Caroline minuscule; the letters are somewhat heavy, a little inclined to the right, the upper shafts often clubbed with remarkably few pre-Caroline forms: sporadic open *a* from the exemplar; *deri* (rel. pron.) in *der itu sunt cōmanno habet (qui mille viros habet)* in the last line of Pl. 9, col. 2, may point to the *t* with the cross beam drawn down of the exemplar. 2. Cod. S. Galli 911 in 8vo, probably written in the last quarter of the eighth century, of which the editor gives twelve specimens (Pls. 21–23), illustrating perhaps ten different hands. Here we have

interesting although by no means calligraphic Rhaetian minuscule types, in which Caroline forms are absent or only represented by a few traces. Cursive elements with their many ligatures predominate; and there are some half uncial (insular?) traces, and, indeed, the rubricators betray Irish usage. As a contrast to the *one* experienced scribe of Pa, we have here a group of scribes not one of whom was able to write a really successful minuscule. 3. Plates 24 and 25 are the first and last pages of the Reichenau manuscript (fols. 76 and 90), which, now bound up with two others, forms Cod. Aug. cxi of the Karlsruhe library. It is a small cramped Caroline minuscule, which, owing to its pronounced pre-Caroline elements, I would date the first half of the ninth century, not, with Steinmeyer (*Althochdeutsche Glossen*, iv, p. 401), tenth century. 4. Plates 26-35 are specimens from Cod. Jun. 25 of the Bodleian, from Murbach in Alsace; they illustrate the Glossaries Jb, Jc, Ja, and the *Murbach Hymns* (ed. by E. Sievers, Halle, 1874). Written by several hands of the early ninth century, they show early Caroline minuscule types with a strong admixture of pre-Caroline elements; the familiar *ti*-ligature appears even for the unassibilated sound, e.g. in *prutigomo* (Pl. 31, l. 16). This and the occasional occurrence of a delta-shaped *o* remind one of the usage in St Gall documents of the late eighth century (cf. E. A. Loew, *Studia Palaeographica*, 1910, p. 21, and Steffens, *Lateinische Palaeographie*, 2nd ed., Pls. 38 and 44). The last hand (Pls. 34, 35) shows half uncial character. 5. Pls. 36-38 are from the Cod. Lobcowitz 434 at Prague. It is a *codex rescriptus*, the original writing of which, a Caroline minuscule of the early ninth century with a few insular traces, has been effectively expunged except in the case of fol. 1^r and 51^v and some lines here and there, its place being taken by a small and ugly minuscule of the thirteenth century. On fol. 23^r Steinmeyer (*op. cit.*, iv, p. 604, l. 7) was able to decipher some words of the old writing (facsimile, Pl. 36 b), but I fail to see any traces of them.

Professor Baesecke has not accompanied his reproductions with a transliteration or any description of the writing, probably because they are intended for seminar work. For the former he refers the student to Steinmeyer's *Althochdeutsche Glossen*; and as regards the latter, he apparently assumes that every academic teacher of mediæval philology should be a trained palæographer. We shall welcome a second instalment in due time.

ROBERT PRIEB SCH.

LONDON.

Deutsch-Österreichische Literaturgeschichte. Unter Mitwirkung hervorragender Fachgenossen nach dem Tode von J. W. NAGL und J. ZEIDLER herausgegeben von EDUARD CASTLE. III, Erste Abt. Neuabsolutismus und erste Verfassungsversuche (1848-66). Vienna: Carl Fromme. 1926. 160 pp. 14 Sch.

The starting-point for this new volume of Nagl and Zeidler's *Deutsch-Österreichische Literaturgeschichte* is the re-establishment of absolutism after the political disturbance of 1848. The condition of Europe in the

first half of the century is explained in a brief but adequate survey; this is followed by sections on the reform of education in respect of philosophy and German philology. The chapter on the latter is wholly admirable, being a history of German scholarship in Austria from the sixteenth century to 1918. Among the earlier references we note that Wolfgang Lazius quoted a few strophes of the *Nibelungenlied* in a work published in 1557. Joachim von Watt gave the first course of lectures on the history of German literature in 1512 in Vienna. Simon Roth, a Styrian, occupied himself with German etymology and lexicology about 1570. Passing to the eighteenth century, we are reminded of Matthias Bel's German Grammar for the use of Hungarians and Slavs (1718). Gottsched was received with every mark of distinction by Maria Theresa, and his *Grundlegung einer deutschen Sprachkunst* (1748) became authoritative throughout Austria and Hungary. The first Professor of German 'Wohlfredenheit' in Vienna was Johann Popowitsch, a Slovene (1753), but Gellert's pupil, Karl Heinrich Seibt, appointed Professor of Polite Literature at Prague in 1764, was the first to lecture systematically in German. Valuable work in the collection and transcription of old manuscripts was done by three Benedictines of Melk, viz. the brothers Bernhard and Hieronymus Pez and Franz (Placidus) Amon. Bernhard published the *Wessobrunner Gebet* and several Old High German glosses, Hieronymus the rhymed chronicle of Ottokar. Amon copied Middle High German texts assiduously for fifteen years but unfortunately handed the bulk of his work to Gottsched for the latter's projected but abortive *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*. A publisher was never found, and Amon's transcripts passed with Gottsched's papers to what is now the Saxon National Library, Dresden, where their origin and importance remained unsuspected until our own day, apart from a passing reference by Ebeling in *Hamburgische Unterhaltungen* (1769). Thus the labours of the learned Benedictine, which might have become the foundation of systematic Middle High German studies, were neglected until modern research had outstripped them.

The study of literary history in Austria begins with the celebrated course of lectures delivered by A. W. von Schlegel in Vienna in 1808, followed by those of his brother Friedrich in 1812. The latter founded the short-lived *Deutsches Museum* (1812-13), a monthly magazine devoted to German philology, literature, and art. The example of the Schlegels was followed by many other German scholars from across the border, von der Hagen, Graff, and Hoffmann von Fallersleben, attracted mainly by the unedited manuscripts of the Hofbibliothek. Inspired by Graff, Toscano del Banner (1822-51) began a history of Austro-German literature on a grand scale, but only two sections of the first volume ever saw the light. The first course of lectures on Germanic Philology in the University of Vienna was delivered by Hermann Suttner in 1845. In 1846, after several decades of vain negotiation, the *Königliche Akademie der Wissenschaften* was founded. Its first achievement was to sponsor the Slavonic Grammar of Miklosich. In 1849 Chairs of Germanic Philology were established in Vienna, Prague, Cracow, and Buda-Pest,

and distinguished scholars from Germany and Switzerland were summoned to fill them. Wackernagel refused the Chair in Vienna, which was then filled, first by Karajan, then by Hahn, and in 1857 by the Swiss, Franz Pfeiffer, who, with Johann Kelle of Würzburg, Hahn's successor in Prague, was the real founder of systematic Germanic studies in Austria.

Whereas the reform of an educational system was necessarily slow and the effects only felt in the next generation, Laube's reform of the Burgtheater became effective within a few weeks. With the return to absolutism about 1850, the stage and the pulpit again became the only important channels through which opinions could be at all freely expressed. When Laube came to Vienna in 1845 the Burgtheater, though recognised to be the chief German stage, was not organised to the best advantage of the public or of art. The administrative responsibility was divided between several officials, the choice of plays was restricted by censorship regulations and by the capacity of the actors, the best of whom were past their prime, and the theatre seemed to make no direct appeal to the middle-class public. Laube deliberately set to work to create an atmosphere favourable to a change and by a series of critical essays, by his own plays, and by the personal connexions he soon formed he succeeded in convincing the court and the public that a reform of the Burgtheater was long overdue and that he was the right man to reform it. Fortunately the Lord Chamberlain, Lanckoronski, shared his views, and in January, 1850, Laube was appointed 'artistic director' with the widest discretionary powers. His first act of policy was to enlarge the repertory, which, on his accession to office, was hardly sufficient for a fortnight. By the end of the year he had staged 129 plays, of which 23 were new and 40 revived. In his selection of plays he soon excited adverse criticism, for he was guided almost entirely by their suitability for the stage and little or not at all by their literary value. He knew that his public desired more variety of programme, modern plays with plenty of life and interest. He began with light comedy, especially translations from the French, and passed only gradually to tragedy and to Shakespeare. His critics accused him of choosing the mediocre and lowering the standard of dramatic art, but he pursued his course undisturbed, filled the theatre, pleased the public, and kept his actors busy. He raised the standard of acting and strengthened the staff by the engagement of Baumeister, Gabillon, Zerline Würzburg, and Marie Seebach. Perhaps the most remarkable result of Laube's management was the complete change of tone in the Burgtheater. With the relaxation of the censorship, the variety of the programme, and the frequent performance of modern and even topical plays, the atmosphere became democratic, and the public grew accustomed to the representation of scenes and the expression of opinions which, only a few years before, would have been impossible in the private theatre of the Austrian monarch. It is true that this change attracted unfavourable attention in court circles, and a new appointment to the office of Lord Chamberlain in 1863 led to friction. Prince Auersperg did not maintain the liberal

attitude of Lanckoronski and also showed a desire to interfere in the appointment of staff. Laube managed to maintain his authority until Auersperg's death, but a new organisation of the theatre in 1867 and the prospect of a drastic curtailment of his powers caused him to resign. A few years of reactionary management followed until the appointment of Dingelstedt in 1870.

The editor has clearly had some difficulty in arranging the material of this and the three sections which follow. Laube was not an Austrian but he acclimatised himself thoroughly in Vienna, and his work at the Burgtheater is a vital part of the history of the Austrian theatre. It is true that he understood Vienna and its public and that he recognised the existence of a specific Austro-German type, as in Grillparzer, to whose work he paid signal tribute in his managerial capacity. Still, the special article entitled 'Laube in Wien,' though it avoids duplication of the previous section dealing with Laube as author and critic, is slightly disturbing in a work of purely Austrian scope. The same criticism applies with even greater force to the article on 'Hebbel in Wien.' Hebbel was far more of a stranger than Laube. He might have been expected to have, through his wife, a strong connexion with the Burgtheater, but the truth is that Laube was unsympathetic towards his plays and gave them no chance. Nor did he give Christine much opportunity of displaying her talents in the minor rôles which he usually assigned to her.

In 1850, to encourage the production of light comedy, Laube arranged a competition, and the three prizes offered were gained, in order of merit, by Bauernfeld's *Kategorischer Imperativ*, Mautner's *Preislustspiel*, and Benedix' *Liebesbrief*. The Viennese public was at this time disinclined for tragedy. Moreover, in Laube's opinion, the actors were not yet competent to sustain a variety of tragic rôles. Few performances of classical tragedy were seen under his régime, Halm's *Iphigenie in Delphi* and Anschütz' *Brutus und sein Haus* winning a place by their technical suitability rather than by their matter. Mediæval tragedy had a better chance, as it offered scope for greater display of scenery and costume. Otto Prechtler, Grillparzer's successor in office, laboured hard to achieve success in this sphere. Five of his tragedies were staged at the Burgtheater, but this satisfaction was refused to the unhappy Bachmayr, who had found inspiration in Schiller for his *König Alfonso* (1842) and *König O'Connor* (1845). Bachmayr possessed a spark of genius but failed to give literary expression and dramatic form to his material.

With the engagement of Charlotte Wolter at the Burgtheater (June, 1862), tragedy, though of a second order, took a new lease of life. This celebrated actress had all the qualities of the modern 'star' and dominated the stage to such an extent that the name 'Wolterdrama' was given to a type of play which, though not written simply and solely for her, contained little more than one leading, female part, elaborated to the neglect of everything else. Authors were content to create one striking part, leaving the leading actress to carry the whole play on her shoulders, so that success or failure depended on the filling of the title

rôle. To this type of tragedy belong Weilen's *Edda* (1864), Mosenthal's *Pietra* (1865) and a dozen besides. A talent of a higher order was Franz Nissel (1831-93), who achieved a fair success with *Ein Wohltäter* (1854) but failed to realise his lofty ambition as a tragic writer. In *Perseus von Mazedonien* he developed a tragic theory in the person of the hero who pursues a laudable end by immoral means. *Perseus* was acted in 1862 but could not maintain itself after five performances. In 1877 Nissel made his supreme effort, winning the Schiller Prize with *Agnes von Meran*, but his hopes were again disappointed. Popular recognition came too late, as it did to Grillparzer.

The section on 'Productive Criticism,' the end of which is still to come, deals solely with Ferdinand Kürnberger, dramatist, novelist, and journalist. For seven years a political exile, Kürnberger brought back in 1856 a mind richly stored with a variety of experience. As a playwright he had no success, though Laube praised, but did not produce, his *Quintin Messis* (1848), and *Firdusi* (1865) was twice performed in Munich. A novel, *Der Amerika-Müde* (1855), was more fortunate, 10,000 copies being sold in a few years. The work had no basis in personal experience, but Kürnberger struck an unusual but true note in decrying the glamour of emigration. His hero finds nothing but disappointment in the New World and returns to the settled advantages of the Old. *Ausgewählte Novellen* (1857) are still readable, but Kürnberger showed his greatest strength in the *feuilleton*, in which he dealt conscientiously with the ordinary round of current topics, gradually creating a new interest for the reader of newspapers. The volume entitled *Siegelringe* (1874) contains the political articles for the years 1866-74, forming a chronicle of the growth of public opinion in Austria, and *Literarische Herzenssachen* (1877) renders a similar service to literature.

Final opinion of this *Deutsch-Österreichische Literaturgeschichte* must be deferred until the work is completed. The present instalment is well printed on good paper and the arrangement of the type is judicious, more specialised matter being easily distinguishable from the general run of the text. The illustrations are very welcome. We shall await the conclusion of the work with interest.

G. WATERHOUSE.

DUBLIN.

SHORT NOTICES

The new edition (1926) of Cook and Tinker's *Select Translations from O.E. Poetry* (Boston: Ginn and Co. \$1.48) shows no changes in the preface when compared with the 1902 edition; the date at the end of the preface is, however, omitted. The brief head-notes to *Widsith*, *Beowulf*, *Brunanburh*, *Seafarer*, *Wanderer*, *Ruined City*, *Love-Letter*, *Gnomic Verses*, *Riddles*, *Bede's Death-Song*, *Christ*, *Ruthwell Cross*, *Genesis*, *Exodus*, *Andreas*, *Elene*, and *Phoenix*, have been altered or enlarged, so as to bring them more or less up-to-date. The changes are interesting,

for they show changes of opinion by editor or editors (e.g. *Seafarer*, *Wanderer*, *Ruthwell Cross*, date of *Elene*, pp. 79 and 139), and an unfortunate tendency to neglect English scholarship, and to speak of Cook's interesting theories as if they were the only theories or even facts (e.g. pp. 3, 9, 133, 79, and especially *Ruthwell Cross*, p. 101). The note on p. 175, on translations of *Beowulf*, should have been brought up to date. The Bibliography adds to the 1902 list, the names of Brandl, Ker, Legouis and Cazamian, and the *Cambridge History of English Literature*. P. G. Thomas' *Eng. Lit. before Chaucer* (1924) might have been included. But we still need a manual of the O.E. writings by one who has the necessary knowledge, critical power, and leisure. C. B.

Mr Merrell Dare Clubb's *Christ and Satan, an Old English Poem*, edited with Introduction, Notes and Glossary (*Yale Studies in English*, LXX. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1925. lx + 182 pp. 8s. 6d.), is a welcome edition. Though there has been a fair amount of discussion of the poem or poems that Grein called *Christ and Satan* but which some have considered rather a collection of fragments, the only text since Grein's (1857) has been Wülker's in his revision of Grein's *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie* (vol. II, 1894). Mr Clubb, in the first full and separate edition of what he regards as one poem, essentially the work of one poet (who cannot have been Cædmon), has made good use of his opportunity. His introduction is a convenient survey of the problems connected with the work, and is well provided with references. It is a pity that his careful account of the manuscript (the latter part of Bodley Junius XI) is not illustrated with the facsimiles it requires. His text, the result of close study of rotographs and accompanied with a full record of readings, is conservative; the editor has resisted the temptation to emend unnecessarily and to normalise forms that can be paralleled. The notes are helpful as well as very full.

In a short notice discussion of details is impossible. Attention may, however, be called to a matter of editorial policy. The text marks, by brackets or by difference of type, certain departures from the readings of the manuscript. But the system does not indicate where letters are dropped without being replaced by others, and *forht*, for example, is printed with nothing in the text to show that it is not the manuscript reading (*forworht*). Surely attention should be called in the text to all changes from the manuscript or to none. Again, words or forms due to emendation appear in the glossary with no warning sign. But it is pleasanter to end on the note of thanks to Mr Clubb for his helpful edition.

F. W. B.

With his *Third Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English* (Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1926) Professor Wells continues to deserve the gratitude of English students. The numbering of the pages in this supplement is consecutive on that of its predecessor, and the system of reference to the *Manual* and its supplements greatly facilitates the work of students. Among the more inter-

esting works mentioned as 'in preparation' or 'at press' are a *Middle English Dictionary*, under the auspices of the Modern Language Association of America, and a *Concordance to Chaucer's Works together with the M.E. Version of 'Le Roman de la Rose'*, edited by Messrs Tatlock and Kennedy for the Carnegie Institution of Washington. The latter has now appeared. W. J. S.

Mr Henry L. Savage's *St Erkenwald, a Middle English Poem*, edited with Introduction, Glossary and Notes (*Yale Studies in English*, LXXIII. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1926. lxxx + 96 pp. 8s. 6d.), inevitably invites comparison with the edition of the same poem by Sir Israel Gollancz. Mr Savage, whose text is more conservative, stresses his differences from Professor Gollancz, and his notes are often a commentary on the text and notes of his predecessor. One great defect of the Yale edition is its lack of a facsimile; reproduction of a few lines of the manuscript would greatly help the user of the edition in considering textual points.

The long introduction is closely modelled on—and indeed in places paraphrases—that by Professor Menner to *Purity* in the same series (1920). Mr Savage agrees with those who would ascribe *St Erkenwald* and the poems of MS. Cotton Nero A. x (*Pearl, Purity, Patience, Sir Gawain*) to the same author. (He presses too hard the evidence of parallel common phrases which alliterative poets might easily hit on altogether independently.) Lacking freshness of thought and expression, he yet gives a useful summary of the problem, with plentiful reference to the views of other students.

In his account of the manuscript and of the historical background of *St Erkenwald* Mr Savage owes and acknowledges a great debt to Sir Israel Gollancz. He differs, however, about the sources of the poem. He does not find any sufficient indications of an immediate Latin source; the poet skilfully fused together a number of different elements. These elements, Mr Savage points out, the poet could have found in one work, such as the *Chronica Majora* of Matthew of Paris, without making direct use of Bede and Geoffrey of Monmouth. F. W. B.

The seventeenth-century broadside ballad was in many ways the equivalent of the modern sensational press. Unreliable newsmongering, and not very well written, it is of no little interest as an indication of the popular tastes of the day. In *The Pack of Autolycus* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1927. xviii + 270 pp. 21s.) Professor Hyder E. Rollins edits forty ballads, half of them from the collection of the Oxford antiquary Anthony à Wood. 'Surely,' he says, 'it is a good deed to make these forty ballads accessible.' Agreed; but surely it would be an even better deed to make them accessible in a form more suited to the pocket of the working student as opposed to the well-to-do 'collector.' Issued in a less sumptuous edition, many more than forty ballads could be given for a guinea. There is, too, something incongruous in broadside ballads, which for all their interest are in the main crude doggerel, being embellished with

such good paper and printing and such spacious margins as Mr Rollins and the Harvard University Press here give them.

Otherwise, however, we can hardly have anything but praise for this attractive edition. To each ballad is prefixed a learned and interesting introductory note. The texts closely follow the original broadsides in essential particulars (though end-of-line pointing is sometimes altered), and many woodcuts are reproduced. Other selections from the extant material Professor Rollins has previously issued. His choice here is of the horrific—*Strange and Terrible News of Ghosts, Apparitions, Monstrous Births, Showers of Wheat, Judgments of God, and other Prodigious and Fearful Happenings*—and as the main title suggests, the ballads admirably illustrate Autolycus' tuneful wares that Mopsa and Dorcas found so fascinating near the seacoast of Bohemia. F. W. B.

Miss Kathleen M. Lynch's study in the series of Graduate School Publications of the University of Michigan, *The Social Mode of Restoration Comedy* (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1926. xii + 242 pp. \$3.50), is unquestionably among the most valuable of the several recent works on this subject. Within the last few years we have been slowly approaching a true appreciation of the Etherege School, putting aside at once the fantastic theories of Lamb and the Puritanic attacks of Macaulay. New light has been thrown on the lives of the comic authors and on the history of the Restoration stage. Mr Bonamy Dobrée has sketched delicately the paradox of courtly life in the period and Mr Krutch has outlined the course of moralistic reaction. Miss Lynch has now essayed to fill in what many have felt to be a serious gap in our knowledge, the development of comedy from Jonson to Etherege. Rightly, in my opinion, she stresses the indebtedness of the Restoration authors to previous English example, showing how the 'social mode' of the late seventeenth century gradually took its rise out of Jonsonian and Fletcherian conceptions, modified by the Platonic sentiments cultivated by Queen Henrietta Maria. While perhaps she minimises the importance of such a play as *The Wild Goose Chase*, Miss Lynch has a keen eye for the comic purpose of the various dramatists and is thus able to put the Cartells and the Bromes and the Shirleys in their true historical perspective. After her survey there need be no more talk of the 'revolution' which came with the Restoration; no longer need any critic assert that we owe our Congreve to Molière. The English tradition has now been amply vindicated. A. N.

Some readers of Pope may have felt a mild curiosity to know more of Stephen Duck, the Wiltshire thrasher, whose supposed poetical merits brought him the patronage of Queen Caroline. Such will find more than all they need in Miss R. M. Davis' *Stephen Duck, the Thresher-Poet* (University of Maine Studies, 2 Ser., No. 8. Orono, Maine. 1926. 198 pp.). The net result of the book can only be to convince them that the Queen's conduct was deservedly ridiculed and that Duck's chief merit was to have provided Miss Davis with a subject for experiment in research-work. Even with the help provided her, she has not quite

mastered her craft, or she would not have conjectured the identity of 'Poet Close' with Dean Close of Carlisle (p. 104) in spite of the *D.N.B.*
G. C. M. S.

There was so much fresh speculation in Professor H. W. Garrod's *Wordsworth: Lectures and Essays* (1923) that it is not surprising that it should now have appeared in a second edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1927. 231 pp.). Beyond adding an essay on Dorothy Wordsworth, however, the author has left the book as it stood. This is, I think, regrettable. Not only because the publication of Professor de Selincourt's edition of *The Prelude* has superseded chapter XII, though at the time it had some brilliant suggestions which proved to be correct, but because the book contained much other controversial matter and it would have been interesting to know where to-day Professor Garrod sticks to his guns and where he is willing to give ground to his critics. There are even, I think, minor slips in the first edition which remain uncorrected, for example on p. 58 bottom where 1792, 1792-3 should apparently read 1791, 1791-2, on p. 81 where 'shortly before August 1793' should apparently read 'shortly after' (cp. p. 79), on p. 210 'in 1739' (? 1839). It is a different matter, but still regrettable, that Gibbon's masterly and beautiful autobiography should still be implicitly described as 'vulgar and absurd.' A book of so much lasting value as Professor Garrod's deserved, I think, to be brought as near perfection as possible.

G. C. M. S.

Die vier Zweige des Mabinogi (Pedeir ceinc y mabinogi), Lesarten und Glossar herausgegeben von Ludwig Mühlhausen (Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1925. xii + 144 pp. 7 M.), is a compound text of the Red Book and White Book versions of the Four Branches of the *Mabinogi*. There are 67 pages of text, and 75 of glossary. It is a convenient handbook for those who know German, and the beautiful clarity of the type makes it pleasant to read and use. In the text, the only error that caught the eye in a superficial reading was the bad omission of the rhyme-word *tes* in the second line of the second stanza on p. 65, and the missing word does not appear in the glossary. The list of errors and risky etymologies in the glossary is too long to be discussed here, but on the whole the errors do not affect the sense in translation, which in any case can be checked by M. Loth's indispensable French version. The confusion of *dygwydaw* and *tygiaw*, and that of *hanner* with *anner* are about the worst and they are pretty bad. *Hannerhob* means a flitch, literally 'half a pig.' What is 'unklar' about it? The notes on syllable counting are all wrong; technical scansion in metrics cannot be applied to prose. The final *w* elided in verse was spoken in the period of the *Mabinogi*. One could wish that Dr Mühlhausen had tackled the much needed *Kulhwch and Olwen* instead of this text, which has already been very well done by Professor Ifor Williams.

J. G. D.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

June—August, 1927.

GENERAL.

- Chicago, University of. Abstracts of Theses. Humanistic Series, III. Chicago, Ill., Univ. of Chicago Press; Cambridge, Univ. Press. 15s.
- FEIST, S., Germanen und Kelten in der antiken Überlieferung. Halle, M. Niemeyer.
- Festschrift, F. Kluge dargebracht von O. Behaghel, K. Bohnenberger, O. Damann u.a. Tübingen, Englisches Seminar. 8 M.
- HASKINS, C. H., The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 21s.
- NICOLL, ALLARDYCE, The Development of the Theatre. A Study of Theatrical Art from the Beginnings to the Present Day. London, G. G. Harrap. 42s.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

- FARINELLI, A., Il Romanticismo nel mondo latino. 3 vols. (Letterature moderne.) Turin, Bocca. L. 96.
- ITTER, F., Bibliographie, 1910–11 (Zeitschrift für roman. Phil., Supplementheft xxxv, xxxvi). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 40 M.

Italian.

- ANTONA TRAVERSI, G., e A. OTTOLINI, Ugo Foscolo. I. Adolescenza e giovinezza (1778–1804). Milan, Corbaccio. L. 30.
- BASSI, A., Armi ed amori nella giovinezza di U. Foscolo. Genoa, Stud. edit. genovese. L. 18.
- BOER, C. DE, De renaissance der letterkunde te Florence vóór 1500. The Hague, M. Nijhoff. 4 fl. 40.
- BURIOT-DARSILES, H., Notes sur la littérature dantesque récente en Italie, en Allemagne et en France (*Rev. litt. comparée*, vii, 3).
- CAZZAMINI MUSSI, F., Uomini e libri: Saggi critici. Palermo, Sandron. L. 12.
- CHIARINI, G., La vita di U. Foscolo. Florence, Barbèra. L. 16.
- CITANNA, G., Sulla poesia italiana dal Parini al Leopardi. v. Leopardi (*fine*). (*Critica*, xxv, 4.)
- CROCE, B., La poesia e la letteratura italiana nel seicento (*Critica*, xxv, 3, 4).
- FOSCOLO, U., Discorsi e saggi letterari. Raccolti e illustrati da A. Donati. Milan, Albrighi Segati. L. 12.
- GALETTI, A., A. Manzoni: il pensatore e il poeta. Milan, Unitas. L. 35.
- GOBETTI, W., Opera critica. II. Teatro, letteratura, storia. Turin, Baretta. L. 16.
- Libro del Poema chiamato Città di Vita composto da Matteo Palmieri Fiorentino. Transcribed from the Laurentian MS. XL, 53, and compared with Magliabechian, II, ii, 41. I. Books I–II, xv. By Margaret Rooke (Smith College Studies in Mod. Languages, viii, 1, 2). Northampton, Mass., Smith College. \$1.50.
- MIGLIORINI, B., Dal nome proprio al nome commune (Bibl. dell' Archivium Romanicum. Linguistica, II, xiii). Geneva, L. S. Olschki. 30 fr.
- PFLAUM, H., Die Idee der Liebe Leone Ebreo (Heidelberger Abhandl. zur Philosophie und ihrer Geschichte, vii). Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr. 6 M.
- PULCI, L., Il Morgante. Introd. e note di G. Fatini. I. Turin, U.T.E.T. L. 12.

SCARLATA, G., Dalla selva all' empireo. Saggi dottrinali sulla Divina Commedia. Palermo, 'L' Attualità.' L. 15.

TUROLLA, G., Giovanni Pascoli. Rome, Formiggini. L. 5.

Spanish, Portuguese.

ATKINSON, W., The Pastoral Novel (*Bull. Span. Studies*, iv, 15).

CERVANTES, M. DE, Drei Zwischenspiele. Herausg. von L. Pfandl. (Samml. roman. Übungstexte, xi.) Halle, M. Niemeyer. 2 M. 20.

CRAWFORD, J. P. W., Francisco de la Torre and Juan de Almeida (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xlii, 6).

Estudios eruditos in memoriam de A. Bonilla y San Martin (1875-1926). I. Madrid, J. Ratés.

HATZFELD, H., 'Don Quijote' als Wortkunstwerk. Die einzelnen Stilmittel und ihr Sinn. (Spanische und hispano-amerikanische Studienbücherei.) Leipzig, Teubner. 10 M.

HEINERMANN, TH., Untersuchungen zur Entstehung der Sage von Bernardo del Carpio (Studien über Amerika und Spanien, ii.) Halle, M. Niemeyer. 4 M. 40.

MULERTT, W., Lesebuch der älteren spanischen Literatur. Von den Anfängen bis 1800. (Sammlung kurzer Lehrbücher der roman. Sprachen, x.) Halle, M. Niemeyer. 12 M.

PELLEGRINI, S., Don Denis. Saggio di letteratura portoghese. Belluno, 'La Cartolibraria.'

French.

(a) General (incl. Linguistic).

BEAULIEUX, C., Histoire de l'orthographe française. 2 tomes. Paris, H. Champion. 60 fr.

CLÉDAT, L., En marge des grammaires. ix. Futur dans le passé, ses valeurs modales. (*Rev. Phil. franç.*, xxxviii, 1.)

ESNAULT, G., Lois de l'Argot (*suite*) (*Rev. Phil. franç.*, xxxviii, 1).

HUGUET, E., Dictionnaire de la langue française du xvi^{me} siècle. I, 6. Paris, H. Champion.

(b) Old French.

MURRELL, E. S., 'Girart de Roussillon' and the 'Tristan' Poems. Chesterfield Bales and Wilde.

STANSBURY, M. H., Foreign Languages and Interpreters in the Chansons de geste (Univ. of Pennsylvania Publ. in Romanic Languages, xviii). Philadelphia, Pa.

(c) Modern French.

ARNAOUTOVITCH, A., Henry Becque. 3 tomes. Paris, Presses universitaires. 100 fr.

BELLESSERT, A., Sainte-Beuve et le 18^{me} siècle. Paris, Perrin. 20 fr.

BERRET, P., Victor Hugo. L'homme et sa vie. (Bibl. d'histoire littéraire et critique.) Paris, Garnier. 20 fr.

CHARPENTIER, J., Le symbolisme. Accompagné d'un Florilège d'écrivains symbolistes. Paris, Les Arts et le livre. 12 fr.

DARGAN, E. P., Parmi la descendance de Balzac dans la vie et dans la fiction (*Rev. litt. comparée*, vii, 3).

DE COURTEN, G., I 'Rondeaux' di Cl. Marot. Milan, Alpes. L. 12.

- DURRY, M. J., *L'Ambassade romaine de Chateaubriand*. Paris, H. Champion.
- EGGLI, E., *L'Érotique comparée* de Charles de Villers. Paris, J. Gamber. 35 fr.
- EGGLI, E., *Schiller et le Romantisme français*. 2 tomes. Paris, J. Gamber. 150 fr.
- FEUGÈRE, A., *Un grand amour romantique*. George Sand et Alfred de Musset. Paris, Boivin. 12 fr.
- FORT, P., et L. MANDIN, *Histoire de la poésie française depuis 1850*. Paris, E. Flammarion. 15 fr.
- GIBB, M. M., *Le Roman de Bas-de-Cuir*. Étude sur Fenimore Cooper et son influence en France. (Bibl. de la Rev. de litt. comparée, xxx.) Paris, H. Champion. 40 fr.
- GLAESNER, H., L. Sterne et Xavier de Maistre (*Rev. litt. comparée*, vii, 3).
- GRASILIER, L., *Rétif de la Bretonne inconnu*. Paris, Margraff. 12 fr.
- HAAS, J., *Kurzgefasste französische Literaturgeschichte*. iv. 1820-1900. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 12 M.
- HENRY, M. L., Stuart Merrill. *La contribution d'un Américain au symbolisme français*. (Bibl. de la Rev. de litt. comparée, xxxiv.) Paris, H. Champion. 40 fr.
- LASSERRE, P., *Des romantiques à nous*. Coll. Essais critiques. Paris, Nouvelle revue critique. 12 fr.
- MARESCA, A., Stéphane Mallarmé, poeta simbolista. Saggio critico. Rome, Tip. del Littorio. L. 5.
- MÉRIMÉE, P., *Mémoires inédites*. Paris, F. Bernouard. 45 fr.
- MOREAU, P., Chateaubriand. *L'homme et la vie*. Le génie et les livres. (Bibl. d'hist. litt. et critique.) Paris, Garnier. 15 fr.
- PALACHE, J. G., Gautier and the Romantics. London, J. Cape. 10s. 6d.
- PIERRE-QUINT, L., Marcel Proust. *His Life and Works*. London, A. Knopf. 18s.
- PLATTARD, J., *État présent des études rabelaisiennes* (Coll. Études françaises). Paris, Les Belles Lettres. 6 fr.
- SHANKS, L. P., *Flaubert's Youth, 1821-45*. Baltimore, Md., Johns Hopkins Press. \$2.25.
- SMITH, H. B., *The Skepticism of Anatole France*. Berkeley, Cal., Univ. of California Press. \$1.25.
- SOURIAU, M., *Histoire du romantisme en France*. i. i, ii. Paris, Spes. Each 30 fr.
- VILLON, F., *Œuvres complètes, publiées avec une introduction et des notes par L. Dimier*. Paris, Delagrave.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Scandinavian.

- BEYER, H., *Norwegische Literatur*. Breslau, F. Hirt. 3 M. 50.
- BOJER, J., *Samlede verker*. i. Oslo, Gyldendal. 15 kr.
- Færeyingasaga. *Den islandske Saga om Færingerne*. På ny udgiven af Det kongel. nordiske Oldskriftselskab. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 4 kr.
- GERING, H., *Kommentar zu den Liedern der Edda*. Herausg. von B. Sijmons. i. Götterlieder. (Germanistische Handbibl., vii, 3, 1.) Berlin, Waisenhaus. 22 M.
- GORDON, E. V., *An Introduction to Old Norse*. Oxford, Clar. Press. 10s. 6d.
- KALKAR, O., *Ordbog til det ældre danske Sprog*. Kilde-Fortegnelse og Forkortelses-Liste. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 1 kr.
- LARSEN, H., *The Vocabulary of the Old Icelandic Medical MS. Roy. Irish Acad.*, 23 D. 43 (*Journ. Engl. German. Phil.*, xxvi, 2).

MUNCH, P. A., Norse Mythology: Legends of Gods and Heroes. Revised by M. Olsen. Transl. by S. B. Hustvedt (American Scand. Foundation). London, H. Milford. 14s.

PAULLI, R., Bibliografi over danske Folkebøger fra 16. og 17. Aarhundrede. I. VASENIUS, V., Z. Topelius, hans liv och skaldegärning. Stockholm, A. Bonnier. 9 kr.

VOGT, W. H., Stilgeschichte der eddischen Wissensdichtung. I. Breslau, F. Hirt. 12 M. 60.

Dutch, Frisian.

JENSEN, P., Wörterbuch der nordfriesischen Sprache der Wiedingharde. I. Lieferung. Neumünster, K. Wachholtz. 4 M.

KLOOS, W., Letterkundige inzichten en verichten. XII. Nieuwe literatuurgeschiedenes. Amsterdam, L. J. Veen. 4 fl. 90.

PANNE, M. C. VAN DE, Recherches sur les rapports entre le romantisme français et le théâtre hollandais. Amsterdam, H. J. Paris. 3 fl. 25.

STERCK, J. F. M., Rondom Vondel. Studiën over den dichter en zijn kring. Amsterdam. 3 fl. 50.

English.

(a) General (incl. Linguistic).

Cambridge History of English Literature, The. xv. General Index. Cambridge Univ. Press. 25s.

HOGAN, J. J., The English Language in Ireland. Dublin, Educat. Co. of Ireland. 3s. 6d.

Reference Library, A. English Language and Literature. 2nd ed. (English Assoc., Pamphlet lxvi.) London, Engl. Association.

SPINDLER, R., Englische Metrik in ihren Grundzügen an Hand ausgewählter Textproben dargestellt. Munich, M. Hueber. 5 M. 60.

TRENEER, A., The Sea in English Literature. From Beowulf to Donne. Liverpool, Univ. Press. 10s. 6d.

(b) Old and Middle English.

BRANDL, A., und O. ZIPPEL, Mittenglische Sprach- und Literaturproben (Neuausgabe von Mätzners altenglischen Sprachproben). 2te Aufl. Berlin, Weidmann. 10 M.

Cædmon Manuscript of Anglo-Saxon Biblical Poetry, The. Junius xi in the Bodleian Library. With Introduction by Sir I. Gollancz (British Academy). London, H. Milford. £10. 10s.

SCHLEICH, G., Zur Textgestaltung der mittenglischen Bearbeitung von Susos Orogium Sapientiae (*Arch. f. neuere Spr.*, clii, 1, 2).

SERJEANTSON, M. S., The Dialects of the West Midlands in Middle English. III. (*Rev. Engl. Studies*, iii, 11.)

TATLOCK, J. S. P., and A. G. KENNEDY, A Concordance to the Complete Works of Chaucer. Washington, Carnegie Institution.

WEBER, G., Suffixvokal nach kurzer Tonsilbe vor r, n, m im Angelsächsischen (Palæstra, clvi). Leipzig, Mayer und Müller. 10 M.

(c) Modern English.

BANKS, T. H., The Personal Relations between Denham and Waller (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xlii, 6).

BLAKE, W., Poetry and Prose. Ed. by G. Keynes. London, Nonesuch Press. 12s. 6d.

- BLAKE, W., *The Poems and Prophecies of*. Ed. by M. Plowman. (Everyman's Library.) London, J. M. Dent. 2s.
- BRADNER, L., *The Life and Poems of Richard Edwards* (Yale Studies in English, lxxiv). New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 8s. 6d.
- BRADNER, L., *A Test for Udall's Authorship* (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xlii, 6).
- BYRON, LORD, in *His Letters*. Selections from his Letters and Journals. Ed. by V. H. Collins. London, J. Murray. 12s.
- CASKEY, J. H., *The Life and Works of Edward Moore* (Yale Studies in English, lxxv). New Haven, Conn.; London, H. Milford. 8s. 6d.
- CHANDLER, E. L., *A Study of the Sources of the Tales and Romances of Nathaniel Hawthorne before 1853* (Smith College Studies in Mod. Languages, viii). Northampton, Mass., Smith College. 75 c.
- CHAPMAN, JONSON and MARSTON, *Eastward Hoe*. Ed. by J. H. Harris. (Yale Studies in English, lxxiii.) New Haven, Conn.; London, H. Milford. 8s. 6d.
- CRASHAW, R., *The Poems, English, Latin and Greek*. Ed. by L. C. Martin. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 21s.
- CUNLIFFE, J. W., *Modern English Playwrights. A Short History of the English Drama from 1825*. London, Harper. 10s. 6d.
- DAWTREY, J., *The Falstaff Saga. Being the Life and Opinions of Capt. Nicholas Dawtrey*. London, G. Routledge. 7s. 6d.
- ETHEREDGE, SIR GEORGE, *Works* (Percy Reprints, vi). 2 vols. Ed. by H. F. B. Brett-Smith. Oxford, Blackwell. 15s.
- FEHR, B., *Englische Prosa von 1880 bis zur Gegenwart*. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 6 M.
- FLETCHER, H., *Milton's Use of Biblical Quotations* (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxvi, 2).
- FOERSTER, N., *The Creed of Lowell as Literary Critic* (*Stud. in Phil.*, xxiv, 3).
- GAW, A., *The Origin and Development of I Henry VI* (Univ. of Southern California Studies, I, 1). Los Angeles, Univ. of Southern California. \$1.50.
- GODWIN, W., *Memoirs of Mary Wollstonecraft*. Ed. by W. Clark Durant. London, Constable. 30s.
- GOLDING, S. R., 'The Parliament of Bees' (*Rev. Engl. Stud.*, iii, 11).
- GORDON, G., *Companionable Books*. I. London, Chatto and Windus. 2s. 6d.
- JONSON, BEN, *The Alchemist*. Replica of First Quarto. London, N. Douglas. 6s.
- JONSON, BEN, *Works*. Ed. by C. H. Herford and P. Simpson. III. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 21s.
- LANDOR, ROBERT, *Selections from*. Ed. by Eric Partridge. London, Fanfrolico Press. 7s. 6d.
- LARSON, M. A., *The Modernity of Milton. A Theological and Philosophical Interpretation*. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press; Cambridge, Univ. Press. 14s.
- LOWES, J. L., *The Road to Xanadu. A Study in the Ways of the Imagination*. London, Constable. 31s. 6d.
- MCDOWELL, T., *Sensibility in the Eighteenth-Century American Novel* (*Stud. in Phil.*, xxiv, 3).
- MALONE, K., *Etymologies for Hamlet* (*Rev. Engl. Studies*, iii, 11).
- MASEFIELD, M., *The Story of Fanny Burney*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 5s.
- PARTRIDGE, E., *Robert Eyres Landor. A Biographical and Critical Sketch*. London, Fanfrolico Press. 10s. 6d.
- PINTO, V. DE SOLA, *Sir Charles Sedley, 1639-1701*. London, Constable. 21s.
- PLOWMAN, M., *An Introduction to the Study of Blake*. London, J. M. Dent. 4s. 6d.

- POPE, A., *An Epistle to Dr Arbuthnot*. Facsimile of ed. of 1734; *On the Characters of Women*. Facsimile of ed. of 1735. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d. and 5s.
- PRIESTLEY, J. B., *Thomas Love Peacock*. London, Macmillan. 5s.
- RAILO, E., *The Haunted Castle. A Study of the Elements of English Romanticism*. London, G. Routledge. 25s.
- ROBERTSON, J. M., *Modern Humanists Reconsidered*. London, Watts. 7s. 6d.
- ROCHESTER, JOHN WILMOT, EARL OF, *Collected Works*. Ed. by J. Hayward. London, Nonesuch Press. 25s.
- RUSSELL, F. T., *One Word More on Browning*. Stanford, Cal., Stanford Univ. Press. \$2.50.
- SHENSTONE, W., *Men and Manners*. Selected and introduced by H. Ellis. London, Golden Cockerel Press. 15s.
- STEELE, M. S., *Plays and Masques at Court during the Reigns of Elizabeth, James and Charles*. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 18s.
- TANNENBAUM, S. A., *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore. A Bibliotic Study*. New York, Tenny Press. \$3.
- TANNENBAUM, S. A., *Problems in Shakespeare's Penmanship* (Mod. Language Association of America). New York, Century Co. \$4.
- TEMPEST, N. R., *Rhythm in the Prose of Sir Thomas Browne* (*Rev. Engl. Studies*, iii, 11).
- THOMPSON, E. N. S., *The Seventeenth-Century English Essay* (Univ. of Iowa Studies, iii, 3). Iowa, Univ. of Iowa. \$1.50.
- THOMPSON, F. T., *Emerson and Coleridge* (*Stud. in Phil.*, xxiv, 3).
- THÜME, H., *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Geniebegriffs in England* (*Stud. zur engl. Phil.*, cxxi). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 4 M. 80.
- WALTON, IZAAK, *The Lives of Sir Henry Wotton, Richard Hooker, George Herbert, Robert Sanderson*. With Introduction by G. Saintsbury. (*World's Classics*, 303.) London, H. Milford. 2s.
- WELSFORD, E., *The Court Masque. A Study in the Relationship between Poetry and the Revels*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 25s.
- WHITEAR, W. H., *More Pepysiana*. London, Simpkin, Marshall. 15s.
- WILSON, F. P., *The Early Life of John Donne* (*Rev. Engl. Stud.*, iii, 11).
- WILSON, F. P., *The Plague in Shakespeare's London*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d.
- WILSON, M., *The Life of William Blake*. London, Nonesuch Press. 45s.
- ZACHRISSON, R. E., *The English Pronunciation at Shakespeare's Time as taught by William Bullokar* (*Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala, Skrifter*, xxii, 6). Uppsala, Almqvist och Wiksell. 8 kr.

German.

(a) General (incl. Linguistic).

- BEHREND, F., *Geschichte der deutschen Philologie in Bildern*. Marburg, N. G. Elwert. 7 M. 50.
- GRIMM, J. und W., *Briefwechsel mit K. Lachmann*. Herausg. von A. Leitzmann. 2 Bände. Jena, Frommann. 70 M.
- KOSCH, W., *Deutsches Literaturlexikon*. 5. Lieferung. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 2 M. 40.
- ROETHE, G., *Deutsche Reden*. Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 10 M.
- STECHE, TH., *Die neuhochdeutsche Wortbiegung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Sprachentwicklung im 19. Jahrh.* Breslau, F. Hirt. 7 M.
- TEUWSEN, E., *Einführung in die Weidmannssprache*. Neudamm, J. Neumann. 4 M.

(b) *Old and Middle High German.*

- BAESECKE, G., Heinrich der Glichezare (*Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.*, lii, 1, 2).
 BOOR, H. DE, Frühmittelhochdeutscher Sprachstil (*Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.*, lii, 1, 2).
 JILEK, H., Der Umlaut von u in den Reimen der bair.-österreichischen Dichter der mhd. Blütezeit (Prager deutsche Studien, xli). Reichenberg, F. Kraus. 2 M. 60.
 KONRAD VON WÜRZBURG, Die Legenden. Herausg. von P. Gereke. III. (Altdeutsche Textbibl., xxi.) Halle, M. Niemeyer. 1 M. 80.
 LUNZER, J., Steiermark in der deutschen Heldensage (Akad. d. Wissenschaften in Wien, Phil.-hist. Kl., civ, 1). Vienna, Hölder, Pichler, Tempsky. 7 M. 80.
 SCHATZ, J., Althochdeutsche Grammatik (Göttinger Samml. indogerman. Grammatiken und Wörterbücher). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 12 M.
 Schriften aus der Gottesfreund-Literatur (Traktate und Lektionen; Merswins Vier anfangende Jahre; Des Gottesfreundes Fünfmännerbuch). Herausg. von Ph. Strauch. 2 Hefte. (Altdeutsche Textbibl., xx, xxiii.) Halle, M. Niemeyer. Each 3 M. 60.
 ZEEMAN, D. J. C., Stilistische Untersuchungen über Rudolf von Ems' Weltchronik und seine beiden Meister Gottfried und Wolfram. Amsterdam, H. J. Paris. 4 fl. 25.
 ZINGERLE, O. VON, Die Heimat des Dichters Freidank (*Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.*, lii, 1, 2).

(c) *Modern German.*

- BALL, H., Hermann Hesse. Sein Leben und sein Werk. Berlin, S. Fischer. 5 M.
 BENSINGER, K., Was bedeutet die Goethesche Faustdichtung dem Menschen und der Menschheit. Munich, Allg. Verlagsanstalt. 4 M. 50.
 BREUL, K., The Romantic Movement in German Literature. Illustrative Texts. Cambridge, Heffer. 7s. 6d.
 BROOKS, N. C., A Rheinau Easter Play of the late 16th Century (*Journ. Engl. German. Phil.*, xxvi, 2).
 CARUS, C. G., Goethe. Zu dessen näherem Verständnis. Dresden, W. Jess. 7 M. 50.
 CLEMEN, O., Valentin Ickelsamer (*Journ. Engl. German. Phil.*, xxvi, 2).
 FRICKE, G., Der religiöse Sinn der Klassik Schillers. Munich, Kaiser. 7 M. 50.
 Goethe-Gesellschaft, Jahrbuch der, herausg. von M. Hecker. XIII. Weimar, Goethe-Gesellschaft.
 GUNDOLF, F., Andreas Gryphius. Heidelberg, Weiss. 2 M.
 HAECKER, V., Goethes morphologische Arbeiten und die neuere Forschung. Jena, G. Fischer. 5 M.
 IMLE, F., F. von Schlegels Entwicklung von Kant zum Katholizismus. Paderborn, F. Schöningh. 7 M. 50.
 JONGE, A. R. DE, Gottfried Kinkel as Political and Social Thinker. Oxford, Univ. Press. 11s. 6d.
 KERNER, JUSTINUS, Briefwechsel zwischen Kerner und Ottilie Wildermuth, 1853-62. Herausg. von A. Wildermuth. Heilbronn, E. Salzer. 4 M.
 LIPPERT, W., R. Wagners Verbannung und Rückkehr, 1849-62. Dresden, P. Aretz. 14 M.
 LÜDWIG, A., Ortsnamen in neuerer deutscher Lyrik (*Arch. f. neuere Spr.*, clii, 1, 2).
 NAGL, J., und J. ZEDLER, Deutsch-Österreichische Literaturgeschichte. Fortgesetzt von E. Castle. III, 3. Vienna, C. Fromme. 14 Sch.
 QUADT, M. W., Die Grundlinien der Novellen-Komposition Paul Heyeses (*Journ. Engl. German. Phil.*, xxvi, 2).
 STECKNER, H., Der epische Stil von Hermann und Dorothea (Sächsische Forschungsinstitute, i, iv). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 12 M.
 STREICHER, S., Spitteler und Böcklin. II. Zürich, O. Füssli. 4 M. 40.

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

*A QUARTERLY JOURNAL EDITED FOR THE
MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION*

BY

J. G. ROBERTSON

G. C. MOORE SMITH

AND

EDMUND G. GARDNER



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON: FETTER LANE, E.C. 4

CHICAGO: THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
(AGENT FOR THE UNITED STATES)

BOMBAY, CALCUTTA AND MADRAS: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.
TOKYO: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

Price Seven Shillings net

*Annual Subscription, 25s net post free ; in United States
\$6.00 (single copies \$1.75 each)*

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

PAGE

| | |
|---|-----|
| Chaucer and Lady Fortune. By H. R. PATCH | 377 |
| ‘A Cure for a Cuckold’ by Heywood, Rowley and Webster. By H. D. GRAY | 389 |
| Problems of French Word-Formation. II. By JOHN ORR | 398 |
| The Fifth Book of Rabelais. By ARTHUR TILLEY | 409 |
| A Minor Italian Critic of the Sixteenth Century: Jason Denores. By F. E. BUDD | 421 |

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

| | |
|--|-----|
| The New Chaucer Items. By SAMUEL MOORE.—Notes on ‘The Knightes Tale.’ By P. E. DUSTOOR.—‘A Hundreth Sundrie Flowers.’ By W. W. GREG.—Benedick’s Love Symptoms: Cosmetics and Costume. By M. CHANNING LINTHICUM.—Lincoln v. Dymock and a Scurrilous Play, 1610. By HELEN E. SANDISON.—The Influence of Ronsard. By JANET G. SCOTT.—The Source of Achim von Arnim’s ‘Owen Tudor.’ By KATHERINE JONES | 435 |
|--|-----|

REVIEWS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Chaucer, <i>The Nun’s Priest’s Tale</i> , ed. by K. Sisam (G. H. COWLING).—J. M. Manly, <i>Chaucer and the Rhetoricians</i> (G. H. COWLING).—B. D. Brown, <i>A Study of the M.E. Southern Passion</i> (CYRIL BRETT).— <i>Sir Gawain and the Green Knight</i> , ed. by J. R. R. Tolkien and E. V. Gordon (CYRIL BRETT).— <i>The Libelle of Englyshe Polycye</i> , ed. by Sir G. Warner (E. CURTIS).— <i>The Meroure of Wyssdome</i> , ed. by C. Macpherson (G. R. OWST).—C. H. Conley, <i>First English Translations of the Classics</i> (G. D. WILLCOCK).—Sir I. Gollancz, <i>The Sources of Hamlet</i> (F. S. BOAS).—C. J. Sisson, <i>Shakespeare in India</i> ; P. K. Guha, <i>On Two Problems in Shakespeare</i> (R. H. CASE).—K. C. Balderstone, <i>Percy’s Memoir of Goldsmith</i> ; H. J. Smith, <i>Oliver Goldsmith’s Citizen of the World</i> (H. V. D. DYSON).—A. G. Kennedy, <i>Bibliography of Writings on the English Language</i> (ALLEN MAWER).—G. P. Krapp, <i>The English Language in America</i> (W. E. COLLINSON).—Baudri de Bourgueil, <i>Œuvres Poétiques</i> , éd. par P. Abrahams (L. BRANDIN).—L. Sainéan, <i>Sources de l’Étymologie française</i> (F. S. SHEARS).—E. Lerch, <i>Historische französische Syntax</i> (F. S. SHEARS).—A. Bell, <i>Le Lai d’Haveloc</i> (M. K. POPE).—J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, <i>A New History of Spanish Literature</i> (W. J. ENTWISTLE).—G. Baesecke, <i>Lichtdrucke nach althochdeutschen Handschriften</i> (R. PRIEBSCHE).—J. W. Nagl and J. Zeidler, <i>Deutsch-Österreichische Literaturgeschichte</i> , III, 1, herausg. von E. Castle (G. WATERHOUSE) | 448 |
|---|-----|

SHORT NOTICES

| | |
|--|-----|
| A. S. Cook and C. B. Tinker, <i>Translations from Old English Poetry</i> .— <i>Christ and Satan</i> , ed. by Merrell Dare Clubb.—J. E. Wells, <i>Manual of Writings in Middle English</i> , Third Supplement.— <i>St Erkenwald</i> , ed. by H. L. Savage.— <i>The Pack of Autolycus</i> , ed. by H. E. Rollins.—K. M. Lynch, <i>The Social Mode of Restoration Comedy</i> .—R. M. Davis, <i>Stephen Duck, the Thresher-Poet</i> .—H. W. Garrod, <i>Wordsworth</i> .— <i>Die vier Zweige des Mabinogi</i> , herausg. von L. Mühlhausen. | 485 |
|--|-----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| NEW PUBLICATIONS (June—August, 1927) | 490 |
|--|-----|

Read THE LINGUIST

The New Monthly Magazine devoted to Foreign Language, Literature, Travel, Music.

NOW ON SALE



Interesting Articles by

W. G. Hartog, M.A.,
Litt.D., Officier d'Académie

E. R. P. Vincent

Prof. V. Spiers, B. ès L.,
M.A.

J. F. Porte

N. B. Jopson, B.A.

Clive Holland

Rupert Croft-Cooke

etc., etc.



EACH ISSUE

contains

CONVERSATIONAL LESSONS
in

French
German
Spanish
Italian
Russian
Afrikaans
Esperanto

LITERARY EXTRACTS,
TRAVEL TALKS, etc., etc.

Price **6d.** Monthly

From SMITH'S Bookstalls,
Newsagents, or direct from
the Publishers

24 HIGH HOLBORN, W.C. 1

LANGUAGES by GRAMOPHONE

What the Educationists say
about the Linguaphone Method

G. Noël-Armfield, Esq., Lecturer in Phonetics at Cambridge Divinity School. *December 3, 1924*

"The French records are astonishingly clear."

Algernon Latter, Esq., M.A. (Oxon), Headmaster, The King's School, Canterbury, Kent. *July 5, 1926*

"We have found the Linguaphone records very useful as a help in the teaching of Modern Languages and I consider that the acquisition of the records was a sound investment from the educational point of view."

C. H. Ward, Esq., M.A., Lecturer in German at Huddersfield Technical College. *March 20, 1926*

"Please send the German Linguaphone Records. If they are as clear as the Spanish Records which are now being used in this college they will prove satisfactory."

"I am pleased to report that the Committee of the Technical College, has, on my recommendation, sanctioned the purchase of the German records. They are very clear." *Later—March 30*

"I find your records quite stimulating, and regard them as an almost indispensable adjunct for oral work." *April 23*

LINGUAPHONE LANGUAGE RECORDS

CONVERSATIONAL

COURSES in

FRENCH

SPANISH

ESPERANTO

AFRIKAANS

GERMAN

ITALIAN

ENGLISH

RUSSIAN

LITERARY COURSES in

FRENCH

GERMAN

ITALIAN

ENGLISH

TRAVEL COURSES in

FRENCH

ITALIAN

IN PREPARATION

IRISH DUTCH CHINESE PERSIAN

Linguaphone Language Records are in use in 62 different countries, and have been adopted by over 900 Schools, Colleges and Universities.

Fill in the coupon below now, post at once, and receive by return the

24-PAGE BOOK FREE

which tells all about the Linguaphone Method, the wonderful results it has achieved, what it costs, and how you can have a seven days' Free Trial in your own home!

The Linguaphone Institute
816, Napier House, 24 High
Holborn, London, W.C. 1

BRANCHES:

France: 1, Rue Lanterne, Lyons;
Germany: Potsdamerstrasse 123
B, Berlin; Belgium: "Centra,"
Place de Meir 107, Antwerp;
Holland: Zwart Janstraat 138,
Rotterdam; Spain: C. Valencia
243, Barcelona; Norway: 7,
Akersgaten, Oslo; Hungary:
Kossuth Lajos utca 10, Budapest;
Latvia: M. Pils iela 1, Riga;
United States: 96 Fifth Avenue,
New York; Australia: Box 2838
G.P.O., Sydney; South Africa:
223 Smith Street, Durban.

To Linguaphone Institute
816, Napier House
24 High Holborn, London, W.C. 1

Please send me, Post Free and without
obligation, a copy of the Linguaphone
Book and particulars of 7-days' trial.

Name

Address

Digitized by Google

NEW SERIES]

OCTOBER, 1927

[VOL. XII, No. 47

PRICE 2s. NET

HISTORY

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Editor: Miss E. JEFFRIES DAVIS, M.A.

Articles:

CONTENTS

The Teaching of History in France (*concluded*). By Professor Ch. V. LANGLOIS.

Athenian Democracy. By M. CARY, D.LITT.

History in Pantomime. By A. H. DODD.

A Memorandum on the Provision of History Books for Elementary Schools
approved by the Council of the Association.

Historical Revisions: XLIII.

Lord Salisbury and Turkey. By W. N. MEDLICOTT.

Notes and News.

Correspondence.

Reviews and Short Notices.

New Books and New Editions.

LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED

NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

INDEX TO MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

VOLUMES XI-XX.

This Index, which is now on sale, is a valuable book of reference,
both to subscribers, and to all who have access to the *Modern
Language Review* in libraries. From any bookseller, 5s.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, 1926

Edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association by

D. EVERETT

To be published in the early Autumn. Orders for this volume, and
permanent orders, may be sent to the Hon. Treasurer, M.H.R.A.,
The University, Liverpool.

Non-members order through any bookseller.

REVISTA DE FILOLOGÍA ESPAÑOLA

Se publica en cuadernos trimestrales, formando cada año un tomo de unas 450 páginas. Comprende estudios de bibliografía, historia de la civilización, lengua, literatura y folklore, y da información bibliográfica de cuanto aparece en revistas y libros, españoles y extranjeros, referente a la filología española.

Director: R. MENÉNDEZ PIDAL.

Redactores: A. ALONSO, A. CASTRO, V. GARCÍA DE DIEGO,
T. NAVARRO TOMÁS, F. DE ONÍS, A. G. SOLALINDE.

Secretario de redacción: H. SERÍS.

SUMARIO DEL CUADERNO 2º, TOMO XIII, 1926.

LEO SPITZER.—*Notes étymologiques.*

S. GILI GAYA.—*La entonación en el ritmo del verso.*

JOSÉ F. MONTESINOS.—*Notas sobre algunas poesías de Lope de Vega.*

MISCELÁNEA: W. MEYER-LÜBKE, *Esp. "ceño,"* pág. 177.—M. HERRERO GARCÍA, *Morato Arráez,* pág. 179.

NOTAS BIBLIOGRÁFICAS: ANIBAL, C. E., *Mira de Amescoa, I: El arpa de David, Introduction and Critical text.* II: *Lisardo, his pseudonym,* J. F. Montesinos.—JEAN BARUZI, *Saint Jean de la Croix et le problème de l'expérience mystique,* E. Giménez Caballero.—MELENDEZ VALDÉS, *Poetas,* Dámaso Alonso.—TREND, J. B., *Luis Milán and the vihuelistas,* E. M. Torner.—*Poema de Mio Cid.* Versión de Pedro Salinas, Dámaso Alonso.—GARCÍA-RENDUELES, E., *Los nuevos bablistas,* G. A.

BIBLIOGRAFÍA. NOTICIAS.

PRECIOS DE SUSCRIPCIÓN: España, 20 pesetas año. Extranjero, 22 pesetas año. Suscripción a la tirada aparte de la *Bibliografía*: 4 pesetas año. Número suelto: España, 5 pesetas. Extranjero, 5.50 pesetas. Colecciones completas y tomos sueltos: se venden al mismo precio de suscripción.

Redacción y administración: CENTRO DE ESTUDIOS HISTÓRICOS, Almagro, 26, Madrid

Vol. IX is commenced with the October 1927 issue.

YOUR SUBSCRIPTION IS INVITED.

Modern Languages

A REVIEW OF FOREIGN LETTERS, SCIENCE,
AND THE ARTS

EDITED BY E. A. CRADDOCK, M.A.

*Published five times a year—FEBRUARY (double number 2/-), APRIL,
JUNE, OCTOBER, DECEMBER. Price 1/- net each. (Postage 1d. extra.)*

The following articles were among those included in the June 1927 issue.

PSYCHOLOGY OF MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHING

DRAWING AS AN AID TO LANGUAGE TEACHING (J. Merchistom)

ENGLISH IN POLAND (S. Pietruszanka)

THE EDUCATIONAL FIXED FILM (E. Fowler)

THE STUDY OF ITALIAN IN ENGLAND

UNE QUINZAINE ANGLAISE À PARIS

GERMAN IN SCHOOLS

Published for the Modern Language Association by

A. & C. BLACK, LTD., 4, 5 & 6 SOHO SQ., LONDON, W.1

CAMBRIDGE BOOKS

Recently Published



THE PLACE-NAMES OF WORCESTERSHIRE.

By A. MAWER and F. M. STENTON, in collaboration with F. T. S. HOUGHTON. English Place-Name Society Publications, Volume IV. Demy 8vo. With a map. The price of this volume with its essential companion, *The Chief Elements used in English Place-Names* (Volume I, Part 2), is 23s net. This volume separately, 20s net.



AN EARLY IRISH READER. By N. KERSHAW CHADWICK. Demy 8vo. 6s net.

The text which Mrs Chadwick has chosen as best adapted to serve as an introduction to Early Irish Literature in the original is *Scél Mucci Mic Dathó*, or "Story of Mac Dathó's Pig." It is of very varied character and several types of prose and poetry are represented in it. The introduction, notes, and vocabulary are designed especially to help students who are beginning Early Irish without a teacher.



THE POETRY OF THE AGE OF WORDSWORTH.

I. An Anthology of the Five Major Poets selected by J. DOVER WILSON. Crown 8vo. 7s 6d net. *The Cambridge Anthologies*.

The Cambridge Anthologies, which, after the publication of two volumes, had to be laid aside owing to the war, are recommenced by the publication of the present volume. The aim of the series was to provide the general reader with first-hand knowledge of the literary atmosphere and social conditions in which the masterpieces of English literature were created; and two anthologies, Professor Dover Wilson's *Life in Shakespeare's England* and Mr W. T. Young's *Poetry of the Age of Shakespeare*, were duly issued. The present volume is intended to provide, in a handy form, an anthology of the best work of Wordsworth, Coleridge, Byron, Shelley, and Keats.



LOUIS HÉMON

MARIA CHAPDELAINE. Edited by E. A. PHILLIPS. With notes, a vocabulary, and a map. Crown 8vo. 4s 6d.

This edition of *Maria Chapdelaine* has been prepared with the hope that Louis Hémon may become as well known here as he deserves to be.



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

FETTER LANE : LONDON : E.C. 4

THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

issues many attractive series to which it is constantly adding fresh titles.
For instance there is

*The series of OXFORD ENGLISH POETS, in which have appeared
within the last six weeks*

THE POEMS ENGLISH, LATIN AND GREEK OF
RICHARD CRASHAW

Edited by L. C. Martin

21s. net

"...an edition of a poet as poets should be edited, but as only such editors as Mr Martin, and only such publishers as the Oxford Press can or will produce."

MANCHESTER GUARDIAN

"...Oxford, under the accurate and scholarly conduct of Mr Martin has presented the world with what must surely rank as the definitive text of all Crashaw's poetry...."

Arthur Waugh in THE DAILY TELEGRAPH

THE POEMS AND LETTERS OF ANDREW
MARVELL

Edited by H. M. Margoliouth

2 volumes. 31s. 6d. net

"...It is a model of its kind. Unless new poems are unearthed it is unlikely to be superseded...."

J. C. Squire in THE OBSERVER

The series of OXFORD STANDARD AUTHORS

THE ESSAYS OF MONTAIGNE

Newly translated by E. J. Trechmann

2 volumes. 3s. 6d. net each

"...Mr Trechmann's version, which has been revised in the light of the best French editions of recent years, is far more accurate than any of its predecessors...."

MORNING POST

THE POETICAL WORKS OF JOHN GAY

Edited by G. C. Faber

3s. 6d. net

"...a work of finer scholarship and more real importance than is to be found in many a grandly arrayed volume of ten times its price...."

NOTES AND QUERIES

(Both these volumes are obtainable also in the series of Oxford Poets)

and

The famous WORLD'S CLASSICS (2s. net each)

THE MEMOIRS OF BENVENUTO CELLINI
SELECTED ENGLISH SHORT STORIES. 3rd Series
WALTON'S "LIVES"

THE MEMOIRS OF THOMAS HOLCROFT

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Amen House

E.C. 4





